REPORT RESUMES

ED 015 796 RC 000 148

READINGS FOR UNDERSTANDING SOUTHWESTERN CULTURE.
ADAMS STATE COLL., ALAMOSA, COLO.
PUB DATE 63
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.16 77P.

DESCRIPTORS- AMERICAN CULTURE, ACCULTURATION, *CULTURE, *CULTURAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS, *CULTURAL FACTORS, CROSS CULTURAL TRAINING, CULTURAL DIFFERENCES, HISTORY, LANGUAGE, *MEXICAN AMERICANS, POPULATION DISTRIBUTION, PUBLIC HEALTH, *SPANISH AMERICANS, SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING, VALUES,

THIS COLLECTION OF PAPERS HAS BEEN PREPARED TO HELP THE TEACHER UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE CHILD'S DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURE AND PERSONALITY. IT IS ASSUMED THAT KNOWLEDGE OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL MILIEU ADDED TO KNOWLEDGE OF THE BIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL WILL ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHERS. THE PAPERS INCLUDED ARE TITLED AS FOLLOWS--(1) AMERICAN CULTURE, (2) MEXICAN POPULATION IN SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES, (3) THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE IN SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES SINCE 1846, (4) THE SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE OF THE SOUTHWEST, (5) CULTURE PATTERNS OF THE SPANISH SPEAKING COMMUNITY, (6) MANANA IS TODAY, (7) LANGUAGE BARRIERS IN INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS, (8) SPANISH, MEXICAN, NATIVE - THE PROBLEMS OF NOMENCLATURE, AND (9) CULTURAL FACTORS IN PUBLIC HEALTH. (ES)

ED015796

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

READINGS FOR UNDERSTANDING
SOUTHWESTERN CULTURE

The
Center for Cultural Studies

Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado

1963

RC 000 148

ALFRED M. POTTS, 2d

CONTENTS

Page

Preface i

American Culture
Lyle Saunders 1

Mexican Population in Southwestern United States
Elizabeth Broadbent 7

The Social History of Spanish-Speaking People in Southwestern United States Since 1846
Lyle Saunders 12

The Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest
Lyle Saunders 24

Culture Patterns of the Spanish Speaking Community
Arthur L. Campa 33

Mañana is Today
Arthur L. Campa 43

Language Barriers in Intercultural Relations
Arthur L. Campa 49

Spanish, Mexican, Native - The Problems of Nomenclature
Arthur L. Campa 55

Cultural Factors in Public Health
Lyle Saunders 59

PREFACE

An analogy might be drawn between the contributions this collection of papers may make to the student of education-for-culturation and the time trinity - past, present, future. The knowledges used in contemporary education for the most part are those that have been agreed upon in the past and collected from the past for use in the present. The American society is becoming increasingly aware of the need to relate knowledge and to create abilities for understanding that will serve both for the present and in the future. The teacher has a responsibility to understand the problems related to the child's development of culture-and-personality. Knowledge of the socio-cultural added to knowledge of the bio-psychological will enhance the effectiveness of any teacher.

This collection of talks and articles tends to regard past and present understandings in terms of future use. Its usefulness to the student of cultural forces is thus enhanced beyond the probable usefulness of knowledges existent in and related only to the past. Most of these contemporary statements include recognition of the various stages of culture forms displayed by people who are in transition or in polycultural status. There is sufficient caution expressed, which should be accepted by the student, about the rapidity of current cultural adjustment being made by many of the people of the Southwestern United States. Adjudging the cultural status of an individual must be done in relation to the individual, rather than in terms of general culture traits and values that may be dominantly observable in the group to which he gives major allegiance.

Realization of need for adjustment of cultural values and forms to broader bases usually results when people of limited backgrounds adventure into more complex, more affluent, or more sophisticated social and cultural milieu. As at other significant "broading" periods among particular peoples of the nation, many of the Southwestern "native" population expanded their social concepts through the wider contacts made in the period of World War II. The resulting vision, combined with other forces, has initiated a significant period of more vigorous expansion of socio-cultural competencies.

The student should maintain a realization of the relativeness factor when studying descriptions of humans' characteristics. Be sure to relate the description to the people actually being described. Many suggestions herein of characteristics possessed by the Southwesterners of Spanish lineage refer to those of people and characteristics of particular periods, or particular backgrounds. For example, one observation might be that the older cultural forms generally indicate similarity to older folkway organization. And most of the older folkway cultures were rooted in rural, agricultural-oriented life situations. As the people become more mobile and move to urban areas the differences between the "old" ways and old value systems and the needs of the new social relationships become apparent. When people possess and exercise the ability to make adjustments their inter-relationships generally improve somewhat in proportion to the adjustments accepted. If adjustments in forms and standards are not made a period of conflict and inadequacy in the new situation will usually follow.

Aims in culturation education include the preparation of persons with the abilities to (1) see need for adjusting their standards, (2) know and decide what changes to make in personal and group behavior forms and life values, and (3) use wisdom in activating the concepts they decide to accept.

The permission of the several authors, given verbally over the past several years, to reproduce these papers and articles is very much appreciated. The contribution the collection makes in preparing in-service teachers and teachers-in-preparation with broader understandings has already been proved by the many who have used the original mimeographed copies distributed at various conferences and workshops.

AMERICAN CULTURE

Lyle Saunders *
University of Colorado

Object of the workshop is to consider, reflect on, talk about the variety of relations that exist between two groups of people: Americans of Spanish or Mexican descent who enter into roles of patient, client, student, "suspect", worker in our health, educational, industrial, welfare, or police agencies and the Americans of other origin who in the capacities of professional, clerical, technical, or administrative personnel man those agencies. With this purpose, it would seem not un-reasonable to begin--as we propose to do--with two presentations, this and the one that follows next week, that deal, broadly and generally, with some of the major cultural themes relevant to an understanding of the patterns of interaction that develop when members of these cultural and sub-cultural groups come into contact.

As in past years, in previous workshops in this series, our purpose is not to advance or defend the proposition that a knowledge of culture is the golden key that will open all the doors to an understanding of human behavior--but rather that a knowledge of culture in general, and of our own and that of any group we may interact with in particular, is another tool that may help to understand, control, and improve the relational patterns that we all establish in the course of working and living.

Human beings--ourselves among them--behave as biological organisms, maintaining and protecting themselves in a physical environment that both sustains and threatens them. They behave too as psychic entities, organizing and shaping their experiences into those patterns of temperament and response that we have come to know under the generalizing term: personality. Over and above this, all human beings behave as the incumbents of social roles and as the creators, creatures, manipulators, and bearers of this phenomenon that we designate by the term: culture. The function of culture is to make more certain the survival of human individuals and groups. This is accomplished through the provision of patterned guides to action that operate to conserve energies, to minimize the dangers and wastes of trial and error behavior, and to provide--in the words of one observer--ready-made, tested solutions to vital life problems. Since any culture provides only a limited number of solutions for any given problem and since all the members of that culture tend to use those solutions, the behaviors of persons in a given culture tends towards similarity and regularity. But since different cultures tend to solve similar probelms in different ways, people from different cultures may approach similar problems in quite dissimilar ways. We, for example, handle the problems of maintaining

---

*Abridged from a talk by Lyle Saunders at the Fourth Annual Workshop in Cultural Relations, Denver, Colorado, March 20, 1958.

and restoring health through the complex of knowledge, beliefs, techniques, roles, norms, values, ideologies, customs, rituals, and symbols that make up the institution of medicine. The doctor is a key role in this complex; the laboratory and hospital are key instruments: the use of science is a major, broad technique. Another people may handle problems of health and disease through the use of a cultural complex that includes the shaman, group singing, and sacred or holy areas for treating the sick. It is this dissimilarity of ways of handling common or similar problems that make for the kinds of difficulties in inter-cultural relations that provide the subject matter for this workshop.

American culture, like love in the popular song of a season or so ago, is a many splendored thing. It is the sum total of all the commonplaces of our lives--the things and the ideas, the beliefs and the aspirations, the convictions and the worries, the sentiments and the arrangements that we share. American culture is--among many other things: main street, power lawn mowers, flush toilets and corner drug stores; it is picture windows, and dream kitchens and express elevators; it is Mid-town Manhatten, the cable cars of San Francisco, the Sears Roebuck catalogue and picture postcards from an aunt in Kalamazoo. It is Thanksgiving Turkey, Santa Claus, and skid row--TV commercials, fire sales, and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; it is frozen foods, comic strips, used car lots, and packaged breakfast cerals; it is the waiting room at Chicago Midway airport and Time magazine. American culture is Western movies, eggheads, and all the stories and legends and myths about George Washington and Abraham Lincoln; it is segregated schools, ten-thousand acre wheat farms, doughnuts and apple pie; it is the Ford Foundation and barbecue sauce, advertising jingles, quiz programs, and supermarkets; it is hamburgers, Jim Crow laws, the poetry of Carl Sandburg, drive-in movies, and rock and roll music; it is the PTA, hydrogen bombs, Coca Cola and vistadome railway cars: it is lollipops, fire insurance, paper diapers, and the Supreme Court. American culture is ball point pens, General Motors, and Billy Graham: it is canned soup, garbage disposals, clock radios, cowboys, polyethylene containers, and liquid detergents, it is nylon, stainless steel, municipal golf courses, bill boards, poll taxes, bingo games, pool halls and the League of Women Voters: it is Little Audrey jokes, ten-cent stores, the greeting "What's new?", automation, bubble gum, and homegenized milk. It is everything that is familiar and commonplace to us all--and what makes it noteworthy, from the viewpoint of the objectives of this workshop, is that not one ten-thousandth part of it is known to or shared by the vast majority of people with whom Americans share the earth.

It would take a good many years of steady talking to list--as I have been doing--all the elements that make up American Culture. And when the task was finished we would still have nothing more than a listing of apparently unrelated items. Perhaps a more economical and more revealing way;of moving toward an understanding of our subject would be to have a look at some aspects of the character of the people whose collective beliefs and behavior make up American culture. These beliefs and behaviors are described in detail in the books on the attached reading list.

There is perhaps no characteristic more universally agreed upon than that centering in what some observers have called the cult of progress. As Williams points out, "from de-Tocqueville to Laski, inquiring foreign observers have been impressed with the faith in progress and the high evaluation of the future in the United States as contrasted with Europe. Americans have felt their present to be better than their past and have felt adequate to deal with a future that will be still better."

As John Bury has shown, the idea of progress is a fairly recent one in history and is still not one that is widely accepted by the people of the world. For the ancient Greeks life was a series of recurring cycles, endlessly repeating themselves. In the middle ages, temporal life was felt to be a preparation for after life and people were not generally concerned with making it much different or better than they found it. Only recently has the idea appeared that human nature is capable of being continuously improved and "that society as a whole is moving toward a better order of life." Belief in progress, as Williams points out, "implies acceptance of changes, the idea that changes are tending in a definite direction, and the belief that that direction is good." In America throughout much of its history, the bases for all of these have been present.

Americans as a group are firmly committed to the notions that there is such a thing as progress, that it is inevitable, and that is is good. These beliefs have been validated and strengthened by the enormous technological change of the past century, to the point where we are coming to accept the idea that the instruments of technological change and improvement--science and knowledge--are universally applicable to problems of any order. With knowledge and the scientific method, we can transform, improve, perfect not only the physical world, but ourselves, our systems of relationship to each other, our moral and religious ideals and activities. Knowledge has replaced wisdom as a value for us to the point where we no longer make a distinction between the two. It is not without significance that the wise men of our generation, the ones we turn to for solutions of complicated social, political, and moral problems are the technicians, the scientists, the men of knowledge.

Our belief in progress can be traced to the 18th century idea of the perfectability of human nature. Over the years, though, the emphasis has been gradually shifting toward the idea that perfection will come not through changes in ourselves as much as in changes we can bring about in the physical environment through our technological mastery of nature. But whatever the way, there is little doubt but what we Americans accept, as perhaps no other people does, the idea of improvement through change.

Our time orientation is, of course, directly correlated with our idea of progress. The golden age for us is in the future. Tomorrow will be better than today. "The best is yet to be." This results in somewhat of a devaluation of the present. A great disadvantage of such a point of view is, of course, that we miss so much of what might be valuable or enjoyable in today in our preoccupation to get to the better tomorrow. But there is a comparable advantage: we can put up with a lot of discomfort or frustration or hardships while sustained in the belief that these conditions are temporary and that time will inevitable bring us to better things.

One slight counter tendency noticeable in the time orientation is to be seen in the desire of most of us --particularly young people--to have our cake and eat it to, to mortgage the future for the present enjoyment of the goodies of today. This is exemplified in such trends as installment buying and early marriage and by the war-boom-induced attitudes of young people just starting to make careers for themselves that they should begin with high salaries and with all of the conveniences and comforts that an earlier generation regarded as the end reward rather than as the starting point of a life career. But even in these tendencies there is still the acceptance of the idea that the goodies of tomorrow will be bigger, better, more streamlined, classier than those of today.

The only real rejection of the ideal of progress that I can think of lies in our attitudes toward and feelings about government. Here is an area where we really don't want any change, any progress. Most of us are fairly well convinced that in its essential details a perfect form of government was devised by our founding fathers, and that the less tampering we do with it, the better off we all shall be. This leads us into an intricately paradoxical position. Everything will be better tomorrow, but the best governmental system was devised yesterday. Our form of government is as perfect as human beings are capable of producing, but government itself is a potential menance whose enroachments must be resisted, and the people who hold governmental positions are, in the main, incompetent, unscrupulous, and untrustworthy. We are, as many observers have noted, politically apathetic, disliking restraint, authority, discipline, and reserving the right to make up our own minds about whether we consider laws binding on us individually or not.

With our deep belief in progress it is natural that ours should be an achievement orientation. Few of the positions that carry a high value are based on ascription--that is on inherited family position. Nearly all of them are acquired by achievement, by individual effort and determination, and it is a matter of pride with us that our highest offices are open to persons of lowest birth. Secular occupational achievement is both the right and expectation of everyone and there are few rewards for the person who does not make and succeed in the effort to "better" himself. Our best known and best liked cultural heroes are persons like Abe Lincoln who, embodying the virtues of thrift, ambition, hard work, rose from humble beginnings to the topmost rungs of the success ladder. In recent decades the ascribed distinctions between males and females have tended to fade out and females are permitted to compete in and are judged by their accomplishments in the achievement struggle on almost the same basis as males.

To recapitulate: I have so far referred to these facets of American character and American culture: idealism; a religious or moral orientation: a belief in equality and liberty: political conservatism: a tendency to enact moral values into laws: am ambivalence towards law and order: self-criticism; emphasis on the symbols of love and friendship (weather report on Monitor given by the girl with the "sexy" voice); (G. Lowes Dickingson: "contemputuous of ideas but enamored of devices.") preoccupation with machines and arrangements: a dislike and distrust of authority: emphasis, almost to the point of glorification, on youth; technical competence; a belief in progress; future time orientation; achievement orientation.

There are dozens of others that might have been talked about instead of these: monogamous marriage; acquisitiveness: a profound faith in education, particularly formal education, as the key to personal and social salvation and perfection: an open class system: conformity: emphasis on activity and work: "outward facing rather than inward facing--an orientation to have things happen in the external world rather than in the self· belief in simple answers; humanitarianism and sentimentality: emphasis on efficiency and practicality· high value on material comfort: drive towards security--physical, financial, social; tendency to personalize, *to see issues in terms of people (Roosevelt, Rockefeller)*; nationalism: provincialism; racism.

In the matter of ideals and aspirations we as a people have a wonderful record. In the practice of those ideals, practicularly in the areas of racial and cultural relations, our record is less impressive. Until we learn to behave better toward one another the American creed will not perfectly define our actions and the American dream will remain partly unrealized. The task of this workshop is to find, for one small area, workable ways to improve our performance to bring it more nearly into accord with our American ideals.

Denver

March 1958

SELECTED LIST OF BOOKS ON AMERICAN CULTURE AND AMERICAN CHARACTER

Allen, Frederick Lewis, *Only Yesterday*. kNew York: Harpers, 1931.
Allen, Frederick Lewis. *Since Yesterday*. New York: Harpers, 1940.
Brogan, Dennis W. *The American Character*. New York: Knopf, 1944.
Bryce, James. *The American Commonwealth*. 2 vols. New York: 1888.
Commager, Henry Steele, ed.: *American in Perspective: The United States Through Foreign Eyes*. New York: New American Library, 1948.
deTocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. New York: 1835.
Gorer, Geoffrey. *The Americans: A Study in National Character*. London: Cresset Press, 1948.
Graham, Saxon. *American Culture*. New York: Harpers, 1957.
Hollingshead, August B.: *Elmtown's Youth*. New York: Wiley, 1949
Hunter, Floyd. *Community Power Structure: A Study of the Decision Makers*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
Jungk, Robert. *Tomorrow is Already Here*. New York: Knopf, 1954.
Keats, John. *The Crack in the Picture Window*. New York: Ballantine Books 1957.
Mead, Margaret. *And Keep Your Powder Dry*. New York: Morrow, 1942.
Lynd, Robert & Helen. *Middletown: A Study in Contemporary Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.
Lynd, Robert & Helen. *Middletown in Transition*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937.
Mills, C. Wright. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1950
Mills, C. Wright. *White Collar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
Myrdal, Gunnar, An American Dilemma. New York: Harpers, 1944.
Riesman, David. *The Lonely Crowd*. k New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.
Santayana, George. *Character and Opinion in the United States.* New York: Doubleday, 1956.
Warner, W. L. & others. *Social Class in America*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.
West, James. *Plainville, U.S.A.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
Williams, Robin, Jr. *American Society*. New York: Knopf, 1951.

MEXICAN POPULATION IN SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES *

By Elizabeth Broadbent

(P.16) The Mexican population of southwestern United States comprises virtually the entire Mexican population of the United States. In 1930, the four states bordering Mexico - Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California - contained 86.2 per cent of all Mexicans in this country. Adding to these the states to the north - Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada - the southwestern quarter of the United States contained 92.6 per cent of the national total. In addition to being the predominate area for numerical concentration of Mexicans, the Southwest is the only area in the United States where Mexicans reach a significant proportion in the population as a whole, and the only section containing large areas in which Mexicans represent a majority of the population. In the nine states mentioned above, Mexicans constituted 9.9 per cent of the total count in 1930.

The writer purposes to outline the factors involved in the increase of this Mexican population, to trace the periods of such increase, and to analyse the resultant Mexican settlement patterns at successive stages in recent years.

It is probable that the Mexican population of the Southwest, to a greater degree than that for the whole United States, has grown from year to year more from immigration than from natural increase. From the time when this area was still under Spanish control, Mexican immigration to the Southwest has been stimulated by the recurring economic and political disturbances in Mexico and by the opportunities afforded by the still-developing areas in the Southwest. Such immigration has been facilitated by the easy means of transportation across the long land border between the two nations. The consequent patterns of settlement by Mexicans in this area, however, have not been an evenly developing set of processes, but may be distinguished into two patterns of settlement geographically.

The first period of Mexican immigration into the Southwest began with Spanish colonization of this territory and lasted until, approximately, the beginning of the first World War. This movement was stimulated largely by conditions within Mexico, though obviously to some extent by opportunities within the United States. In contrast to the conditioning factors in the second period of migration, however, this early movement may be largely attributed to the following conditions within Mexico: local pressure of increasing population upon resources: colonization to consolidate control

---

* Reprint from: The Texas Geographic Magazine, Vol. V, Number 2 Autumn 1941, pp 16-24 - The Texas Geographic Society, Dallas, Texas Aktum, 1941

of the Southwest when it was still under Mexican rule; and periodic political and economic unheavals. The distribution of these settlers in the (page 17) Southwest reflected no dominate attraction

to any particular localities other than the general localization of employment and living opportunities which drew other kinds of population. As a simple matter of slow movement northwerd, such immigrants settled first near the Mexican border and were most densely concentrated (page 18) there; then spread out gradually northward and eastward.

The first year in which the results of this Mexican migration may be measured is 1850, when the United States Census recorded persons by place of birth. At that time the enumeration revealed that the Mexican born population of the United States was 13,317. Although this figure might be questioned on the grounds that many of the then loosely organized territories of the Southwest were not completely enumerated, the same criticism can be made of similar figures for a number of succeeding decades. The figures on Mexican-born population for a number of censuses are therefore incomplete and cannot serve as any guide to the total number of Mexicans in the Southwest. The rate of increase which these figures show, however, can be taken as a rough measure of the growth of the total Mexican population during this period. As stated above, the number of Mexican-born persons in 1850 was 13,317 - the result of immigration and natural increase extending over a period of more than 300 years. By 1910, this Mexican-born population had increased to 221,915 - an average increase per decade of about 35,000.

Between 1910 and 1920, a chain of circumstances was initiated which brought about an abrupt change in rate of Mexican immigration and in the pattern of settlement of such immigrants. The increase of Mexican born people from 1910 to 1920 was 264,503, and from 1920 to 1930 it was 165,044. These increases represented, respectively, about eight times the average increase for the six preceding decades. Such sudden rise in the rate of population growth may be attributed in large part to immigration stimulated by a series of events beginning with the entry of the United States into the first World War. The loss of manpower through drafting into military service, and because of virtual cessation of immigration from Europe at a time of expanded production in all fields, caused labor shortages in many industries requiring low-wage and large-volume labor. This shortage was greatly felt in the agricultural areas of the Southwest, where production of staple food was increasing in response to war-time demand. The maintenance of increased defense production, therefore, necessitated some immediate alternate supply of labor in large quantities. The need was met largely by a termporary suspension of immigration regulations pertaining to other countries in the Western Hemisphere. The proximity of Mexico and the easy means of transportation from there into the United States, together with the unsettled condition in Mexico as a result of political disturbances, further stimulated an immediate increase of Mexican immigration to the United States.

Large groups of Mexicans were "imported" to relieve labor shortages in certain areas, and many others came independently on hearing of the great demand for workers. Those immigrants who were brought in groups to remedy labor shortages in specific industries were supposed to have been returned to Mexico by March 2, 1921, but many immigrants whose coming was independent of the "induced immigration" remained in the United States after the war. The passage of new quota laws in the early 1920's tended to continue the shortage of labor in certain industries which had been supplied with European immigrant labor, and the exemption of citizens of other American countries from provisions of these acts stimulated a continuation of immigration from Mexico.

The conditions which effected an increase in the rate of Mexican immigration were also the initial stimuli for the formation of two new types of Mexican settlement patterns in the Southwest. First, the pre-dominatly permanent rural (page 20) character of Mexican population changed to a part-time rurality with complementary part-time urban residence localized in the larger cities. Second, the even distribution by the clustering of a portion of the later immigrants in areas favorable for employment of longer than seasonal duration.

Distribution of Mexican Population in 1910.

As late as 1910 Mexicans in the Southwest were predominatly rural in distribution. Only four cities in the United States - San Antonio, Laredo, El Paso, and Los Angeles - had a Mexican-born population of 5,000 or more, and of these only El Paso had over 10,000 Mexican-born residents. The remainder of Southwestern Mexican population was distributed rather evenly through rural agricultural areas and in small numbers in the larger urban centers of the agricultural areas. Such population was largerly a permanent, settled one. Although there was some local seasonal attraction of Mexicans from one part of an area to another for temporary work, there was little widespread, long-distance, seasonal movement. The advantages of centrality and concentration in certain areas had not yet developed, and the pattern of Mexican settlement in 1910 reflects little more than the similar response of all population groups of this region to favorable opportunities and localities for settlement and employment.

Distribution of Mexican Population in 1920.

Conditions following the first World War brought a new pattern of urban-rural relationships for the Mexican population of the Southwest. Rather than displacing completely the pre-war pattern, however, an altered form was superimposed upon it. As early as 1920, although Mexicans were still chiefly rural in distribution, seasonal rurality and seasonal migration had begun to be the rule for a part of the group. After the initial war-time boom in employment of Mexicans, a falling-off in labor demands everywhere left a large number of Mexicans throughout the Southwest without employment. These were chiefly the newcomers with few ties to the areas into which they had migrated to work; and the majority of these who remained in the United States drifted into the larger urban centers where large numbers of Mexicans were already living. These centers - already focal points for recruiting agricultural labor - became even more important with this new supply of unemployed Mexicans. The economic boom of the middle 1920's, with its accompanying development of new agricultural specialty areas in the Southwest, made these urban centers ideal reservoirs of the seasonal labor required for such crops as cotton and citrus fruits. Soon more Mexicans than the remnant group of World War immigrants were desired. The new groups of Mexicans who entered the United States to take advantage of this demand came at first, not to the producing areas where they might actually work, but to the urban centers where they would be sought as workers or where information concerning favorable working areas could best be obtained.

The distribution of our Mexcian population in 1920 reveals the beginning of this urban concentration. As shown above, the already established centers of urban Mexican population were the first to attract the newer immigrants. The four cities leading in Mexican population in 1910 were still the highest four in 1920, but all had increased from over 5,000 to over 10,000 Mexican-born residents, and no other cities had risen to the 5,000-or-over category.

(Page 22) The second type of change in the pattern of Mexican settlement also began to be evident in 1920. In addition to the alteration of the character of rurality among Mexicans by the addition of a part-time rural group, the distribution of both permanent and temporary rural Mexicans began to change from an even, widespread distribution to a highly localized and concentrated one. Two types of rural concentration began to appear in 1920: first, a clustering near the larger urban centers of Mexican population; and second, a grouping in the hearts of local agricultural areas where Mexican labor was in demand for longer than a single season. The second type of concentration was partly a survival from war-time, when demand for Mexican labor was great in these areas, and partly the beginning of a permanent alteration in the distribution pattern of rural Mexican population.

Distribution of Mexican Population in 1930

By 1930, when all of the conditions favoring these changes in Mexican occupance of the Southwest had been operating for more than a decade, these altered patterns had become fully developed. In that year also, for the first time, the United States Census Bureau enumerated Mexicans as a separate population group, so that the map for that year represents a full picture of the distribution of all Mexicans rather than merely a picture of the Mexican-born group alone, as in the case of the maps for 1910 and 1920.

The 1930 census showed that fourteen cities in the nine states comprising the Southwestern quarter of the United States had a Mexican population of 5,000 or more. Of this number, seven had over 10,000 Mexicans, and three had 50,000 or more. The transformation from scattered to concentrated rurality is also clearly indicated, the major areas of such concentration being South Central Texas around

San Antonio, the Southwestern Gulf Coastal area around Corpus Christi, the lower Rio Grande Valley, the El Paso area, the valleys of the upper and middle Gila River in New Mexico and Arizona, the Imperial and Central Valleys of California, and the Los Angeles area. Farther north, smaller concentrations had developed on the Upper Arkansas River and the South Platte River in Colorado. Each of these areas is essentially a crop-specialty locality requiring large volumes of cheap labor at certain seasons - for the harvesting of cotton, citrus fruits, sugar beets, etc. - and the concentrations of Mexicans in these places at the time of the census - April 1 - may be even less than during the later spring and summer.

The map for 1930 reveals indirectly the third and final change in the character of the Southwest as the center of Mexican population in the United States. Here can be seen the great number of Middle, Western and Eastern cities which had acquired a Mexican population of considerable size in the years following the World War. As agricultural shortages during the war drew Mexicans to the Southwest, similarly, industrial labor shortages drew them to the Middle West and East. Railroad centers, steel-manufacturing cities, and crop-specialty areas - particularly those growing sugar beets - drew first upon Mexican labor from the Southwest during the first World War. Later these centers attracted Mexicans to replace immigrant labor from Europe which had been sharply curtailed by the 1920 Immigration Laws. Before 1910, the states east of the Mississippi contained only 0.7 per cent of all Mexicans in the United States. By 1930, their proportional share, though still small, had increased to 5.2 per cent. In other words, although the Southwest still contains the (page 24) largest percentage of the Mexican population of the United States, the areal spread of the remaining percentage in the rest of the nation has become much greater.

Thus in the period following the first World War, the Southwest besides being the chief area for Mexican settlement in the United States became gateway and temporary stopping place for increasing numbers of Mexicans who moved on into northwestern United States. The migrations of Mexicans within the Southwest tended gradually to become a migration through the Southwest into the industrial East and northern great plains. As the centers of Mexican population in the Southwest had served as a recruiting point for labor in other parts of this one area, in like manner the Southwestern states became a reservoir of Mexican labor migrating to the rest of the nation.

THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE IN SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES SINCE 1846

by Lyle Saunders *

There are, I am told, powerful machines which can take great quantities of awkwardly shaped pieces of metal--such as old automobile bodies--and by compression reduce them to small and tidy cubes. Unfortunately, no comparable tool is available to a sociologist faced with the task of compressing a great number of irreconilable social facts, conflicting testimony, and divergent opinions into the neat and precise dimensions of a thirty-minute talk. I hope therefore, that I may be forgiven if, in my attempt to squeeze into half an hour an account of the experiences of several million people scattered over more than half a million square miles of space and a hundred years of time, I leave many loose ends dangling and many important parts of the story untold.

The Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest are not and have never been a homogeneous people. But biologically and culturally they differ, in both obvious and subtle ways, from one part of the region to another. They come from different places and at different times. They settled in areas geographically and socially different from one another. They developed different economics. They had differing experiences with the social groups among who they settled and who settled among them. As Dr. George I. Sanchez has pointed out,[1] there is not one Spanish-speaking people, but several which bilolgical background, outlook on life, scheme of values, allegiances, and even language vary greatly from one another.

There is no generally accepted system of identifying or classifying the various groups within the Spanish-speaking population. Students of the group have made whatever classification best suited their immediate purpose: old settler and new comer; Spanish, mestizo, and Indian; Spanish-speaking, English-speaking, and bilinguals; and so on. For purposes of sociological analysis, the best division is probably a three-fold one which enables us to distinguish between the rural, village folk of New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona; the industrial farm workers of Texas and California, who live under a curious

---

*Paper read at the First Conference of Historians of the United States and Mexico   Monterrey, September 4-9, 1949.

[1] George I. Sanchez, Spanish-speaking People in the Southwest; a Brief Historical Review. Mimeographed unpublished report made to the Advisory Committee, Study of Spanish-speaking People, at Austin, Texas, November 22, 1948.

mixture of rural and urban conditions; and the truly urban populations of such cities as Los Angeles, San Antonio, Dallas, and El Paso.[2]

But although the Spanish-speaking are a highly heterogeneous people, it will be necessary, for brevity, that I speak of them as if they were all alike. Under the term Spanish-speaking, I shall therefore, lump them all--the Tejanos, the Nuevo Mejicanos, the Californios: the long resident descendants of the pobladordes and the wetback who waded the river day before yesterday; the ricos and the pobres; the migrants and the landowners; the illiterate and the learned; the village dwellers and the inhabitants of cities. And, in one sense, it is fitting that they be grouped together, for, unlike as they are, there are still between them biological and cultural similarities which identify them to each other, distinguish them from the English-speaking population among whom they live, and unite them in membership in la raza.[3]

To give some coherence to what might otherwise seem a collection of random observations, I should like to use as a frame of reference the concepts of folk and urban-industrial societies as described and characterized by Robert Redfield[4] and to speak of what has happened to the Spanish-speaking people in the past hundred years as a transition from a folk to an urban-industrial condition. In doing so I do not mean to imply that in 1846 the Spanish-speaking Southwesterners possessed all the characteristics of a folk society to that in 1949 they may be said to exemplify the ideal urban-industrial population. Rather in that period, the Spanish-speaking group may be thougt of as having changed culturally in the direction of acquiring more of those traits which define an urban-industrial people and fewer of those associated with the concept of a folk society.

---

[2] Each of these groups has characteristics quite different from those of the others. The village folk are a stable, land-owning people, highly self sufficient and self reliant, whose social organization, rooted in centuries of isolation, has remained intact. The workers in industrial agriculture are largely landless newcomers, marginal people with little status and few possessions, socially and personally disorganized. The urban populations are rapidly acquiring middle class status and many have already adopted ideas, sentiments, and values which make them almost indistinguishable from the Anglo population

[3] It is a rather curious paradox that, although it is quite easy for almost anyone in the Southwest to identify easily and accurately a member of the Spanish-speaking group, it is almost impossible to work out a satisfactory set of criteria for precisely defining them.

[4] Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society". American Journal of Sociology. 52:29 3-308, January 1947.

Dr. Redfield, as many of you will recall, described the ideal type folk society in terms of the following characheristics:[5]

1. Small population aggregations in which, typically, everyone knows everyone else.

2. A high degree of isolation from other cultures.

3. Communication by oral rather than by written symbols and little communication of any sort outside the immediate group.

4. A homogeneous population, with relatively little division of labor.

5. A slow rate of social change.

6. A simple technology.

7. Economic independence based on a subsistence economy.

8. A strong sense of group identification.

The contrasting concept is that of a urban-industrial society which can be described in almost exactly opposite terms: large, impersonal population aggregations; much interaction with other groups; considerable communication by written symbols; much specialization; rapid social change; a complex, power technology; economic interdependence; and a relatively weak sense of group identification, except in times of crisis.

In 1846 and for a considerable time thereafter, the Spanish-speaking population of the borderlands possessed many of the characteristics of a folk people. Most of them lived in small, scattered communities or on isolated farms and ranches. The rhythms of life were seasonal, as they had been for hundreds of years. Each community was largely self-sufficient; each individual possessed, in general, the same knowledge and skills as others in his age or sex group. The level of literacy was low; reading materials were scarce. Men learned and communicated by the spoken word. Formal education, where it existed at all, was brief, narrow in scope, and limited to a small proportion of the population. The lore of the group was largely transmitted from one generation to another by the spoken word, from parent to child within the family, from family to family by means of the songs and stories and sayings and superstitions which were the common heritage of all the people. Tools were few and simple; the major source of power was the muscles of animals and men. Travel was slow, difficult, and expensive, and most people were born, lived and died in or near a single community. Social mobility was also difficult. The means by which a man might change his status were few, and most people remained all their lives on the social level into which they were born. Social change was slow and, within the lifetime of a man, almost imperceptible. The relations between people were impersonal, and every person in a community knew every other person in all his social roles. Uniformity of knowledge, behavior, and belief was the rule, and had any social investigator been present to measure the range of any cultural trait, he would have found few deviations and much clustering around the norm.[6] Their lives are regulated not by the calendar, but by the clock. Economic self-sufficiency is rare; most of them like most of the rest of us, are dependent on a job and wages. The handy man who could do anything is being replaced by the specialist, and men tend to work, not in cooperation on the same general tasks, but in competition in a variety of occupations. Nearly everyone can read and write;[7] and everyone everywhere is constantly confronted by examples of the written word. The lore of the group, expanded enormously to the point where no one can comprehend it all, is transmitted to the children through written symbols in formally organized situations. For every copy of a newspaper that was read in 1846 there are now a thousand which bring their readers into contact with a wide, complex and bewildering world. The songs and sayings and superstitions of the folk are remembered only by los viejos; the common heritage of the new generation is Mickey Mouse and Superman and the endless procession of villains and heroes who pursue each other on the movie screens and threaten each other through the radio sets. The muscles of men and animals have been supplemented by the tremendous power of internal combustion and steam engines and electric motors; power that, in one form or other, is available to and used by nearly everyone. Travel is rapid and inexpensive, and among the Spanish-speaking people, as among everyone else in the United States, there is a great coming and going. Many a child of ten is already familiar with a dozen states and has called twenty houses home; many a man who was born in Taos or McAllen or Reynosa is buried on Okinawa or Cassino Beach or Bataan, places that a hundred years ago not one Spanish-speaking Southwesterner in a thousand years had even heard about. Social mobility, too, is comparatively easy. No person need stay in the social class into which he was born. The acquisition of wealth or education or a new occupational or professional skill or a new set of social graces is enough to move one up the social ladder, a ladder which has many more rungs and much greater distance between top and bottom than that of a hundred years ago. Social change is rapid; new materials, new machines, new amusements, new medicines, new styles in clothes, reading materials, architecture, furniture, religion, parent-child relations, and nearly everything else appear in bewildering succession.[8] In larger cities and to a considerable extent every~~else~~where, relations between persons are increasingly impersonal, and one has an opportunity to know other people, not as whole personalities, but only in single roles and formal situations--as teacher or pupil, merchant or customer, doctor or patient, employer or employee, official or citizen. Diversity of knowledge, belief and behavior.is the rule, and the social investigator of today who attempts to measure the range of any cultural characteristic will find so many differences that even the concept of a norm is almost meaningless.

---

[5] These are adapted from Redfield's article. The order and phrasing are mine, Not all the characteristics discussed by Redfield are included.

---

[6] These statements, of course, represent a great oversimplification of the actual situation. They also more nearly describe the situation in New Mexico than in Texas or California. In general, as one moved north, east, or west from the isolated villages of New Mexico and southern Colorado he would have noted increasing heterogeneity,

[7] Actually, inability to read or write may be more common among the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest than is generally supposed. A recent survey, the results of which are still unpublished, revealed that more than half of nearly 17,000 Spanish-speaking residents of Hidalgo County, Texas, could not read or write Spanish or English and could not speak English.

The principal points of difference between the lives of the Spanish-speaking Southwesterners of 1846 and those of today can perhaps be summed up in the statement that the former lived mainly in communities in which the family was the principal social unit, relations were personal, techniques were simple, and no type of activity[9] was much more important than any other, whereas the Southwesterner of today lives in a society in which the individual is the center of emphasis, relations are largely impersonal, techniques are complex, and nearly all other types of activity are subordinated to the economic.

What has happened to the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest in the past hundred years is, of course, similar to and has been influenced by what has happened to the people in other parts of the United States and, to a lesser extent, in Mexico and the rest of the world during that period. To oversimplify, two main streams of change can be distinguished; the general change in the direction of an urban-industrial civilization which has been going on at varying rates in all but the most isolated areas of the world, and the particular change that has come about as the Spanish-speaking people have adjusted to the Anglo culture which has increasingly impinged upon them. The rate and direction of both kinds of change have been affected by events occuring both in the Southwest and outside it, and the changes in the condition of the Spanish-speaking people which have occured have been associated with a number of factors which seem in retrospect to have been both causes and effects of change. One such factor is the size of the Spanish-speaking population.

---

[8] So prevalent is the new and so rapid the change that we have even developed as a popular and much used greeting the question, "What's new?".

[9] With the possible exception of religion.

Although the Southwest was discovered and settled by Spanish-speaking people, no great numbers of them ever came to the area prior to the present century. In 1850 there were fewer than 400,000 people in the entire Southwest, of whom not more than 100,000 could have been Spanish-speaking.[10] The majority of this group were members of families who had been in the area several generations or more and who, until the early part of the 19th century, had had little contact with English-speaking people. In the ten year period, 1850-1860, the population of the border states nearly tripled. Very few of the newcomers, however were Spanish-speaking, so that where the Spanish-speaking group had been outnumbered about four to one in 1850[11], by 1860 they made up about one-tenth of the total population of the Southwest. The result was a powerful pressure on the Spanish-speaking people to adjust to the Anglo[12] culture, a pressure which was minimized for a time by the facts that the total population of the region was still not large enough to necessitate many contacts, by the tightly knit social organization of the Spanish-speaking communities, by the frontier conditions under which they ~~and~~ Anglos lived, and by the continuing isolation of the village population of New Mexico, where a large proportion of the Spanish-speaking group lived.

---

[10] The combined populations of New Mexico, Texas, and California in 1850 totaled 366,736. Arizona, when the first count was made in 1870, had only 9,658 people. The major concentration of Spanish-speaking in 1850 was in New Mexico which had a total population of only 61,547. Assuming 60,000 of the New Mexicans to have been Spanish-speaking and accepting the estimates of Rankin (1848) and Bracht (1850) of 20,000 "Mexicans" in Texas, the number of Spanish-speaking in the entire area would be about 100,000. The Mexican-born population of the United States in 1850 was only 13,317.

Carey McWilliams in his book North From Mexico (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1949) says that at the time of the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo there were about 75,000 Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest distributed as follows: 60,000 in New Mexico; 7,500 in California; 5,000 in Texas; 1,000 in Arizona.

[11] It should be remembered that, contrary to common belief, there was no time when the Spanish-speaking were the dominant group numerically in the Southwest, considered as a whole. At no time before 1900 did their numbers exceed that of the Indians; at no time since 1900 have they equalled the numbers of the English-speaking group. They have been, however, and continue to be the largest population group in certain small areas.

[12] The term Anglo is used throughout this paper, in preference to the more awkard term English-speaking people, to designate the numerically dominant, natively English-speaking population of the Southwestern states who are, broadly speaking, culturally indistinguishable from the inhavitants of other areas of the United States. There is, unfortunately, no acceptable comparable term to designate the Spanish-speaking group.

During the years since 1860 the English-speaking population of the Southwest has continued to grow at a faster rate than that of the Spanish-speaking group. The natural increase of the latter group has probably been greater than that of the Anglos, but the westward movement of English-speaking people has brought far greater numbers to the Southwest than have come up from the South by way of Mexico.

Until about 1900 there was only a slow, gradual drift of people northward into the border country. In no year between 1846 and 1940 were as many as a thousand immigrants from Mexico recorded; in many years there were fewer than a hundred.[13] After 1900, the flow of people from Mexico to the Southwest was greatly affected by a number of events, the chief of which were the Mexican revolution; the first World War and the consequent demand for workers in the United States: the series of immigration laws passed by the United States which reduced immigration from non-American countries; the depression of the 1930's; the second World War; and the recent beginnings of what we euphemistically call economic recession. The effect of these events on migration from Mexico is too well known to need repeating here.[14] It is enough to say that the net result was a vast increase in the number of Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest, a corresponding increase in the number of contracts between Spanish-speaking group, particularly in Texas and California, to which most of the migrants came.

Nobody knows with any certainty how many Spanish-speaking people there are in the Southwest today. Informed estimates range from two to three and a half million. The correct figure is probably somewhere between two and a half and three million.

---

[13] It is quite true that the recorded immigration has been consistantly less than the actual number of persons crossing the border, but even allowing for this fact, the northward movement of people from Mexico in the last half of the 19th century was negligible as compared with the westward movement of Anglos into the Southwest.

[14] For a discussion of the population effects of most of these forces see Elizabeth Broadbent, "The Mexican Population in Southwestern United States," Texas Geographic Magazine, 5:15-24, Autumn, 1941.

[15] The United States Census of 1940 enumerated 1,861,400 white persons of Spanish-mother tongue, approximately five-sixths of whom were living in the Southwest. There is much reason to believe that this figure, which is based on a five per cent sample question, is much too low. Recent estimates of the Study of Spanish-speaking People, a project of the University of Texas, place the Spanish-speaking population of that state at about a million and a quarter.

A second major factor in the changes which have taken place among the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest since 1846 has been the development of transportation and communication systems. It was the coming of railroad in the 1870's and 1880's and the later development of an extensive highway system that linked the Southwest with the rest of the United States, made possible the rapid elimination of frontier conditions, and assured the dominance of the Anglo culture in the region. The train, the automobile, and the truck brought people and manufactured products to the Southwest, people who were the bearers of a vigorous, expanding culture and products that were attractive and desirable, but which could only be obtained by the expenditure of money. The train, the automobile, and the truck helped to create desires for new goods and services; they also helped to provide jobs by which the means to satisfy those desires could be obtained. Both directly and indirectly they were powerful forces influencing both the direction and rate of change.

The people who came in on the railroads were an aggressive people. Behind them was a power of a young and growing nation. Before them was a third of a continent to be exploited, potentially productive land inhabited only by a handful of what, to some of them, were merely primitive savages and a relatively small number of what one of them, with characteristic lack of both restraint and enlightment, called "a feble, dastardly, supersticious priest riden race of mongrels."[16] Against their assurance, their numbers, their vigor, their technology, and their resources the Spanish-speaking people could master few defences, and it is not surprising that, in all but the most isolated places, the tempo of cultural change accelerated rapidly in the closing years of the 19th century. The few areas that managed to retain much of their old culture relatively intact escaped the general fate only until the first World War. The young men who volunteered or were drafted for service in that war returned throughly saturated with Anglo ideas and Anglo ways. Some of the ideas and ways failed to survive the test of village life, but many lasted and they, together with the gasoline pump, the canned peach, and the mail order catalog, have operated to bring about sometimes slow but always certain changes in the old ways of living.[17]

---

[16] Quoted without reference to source in Williams Ransom Nogan, The Texas Republic (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1946), p. 14.

[17] World War II had even more far-reaching effects. In many largely Spanish-speaking communities a considerable roportion of the adult males left their homes during the war, either to serve in the armed forces or to work in wartime industries located in or near large cities. There is already abundant evidence in Texas and elsewhere that those who left, particularly the younger men among them, will never be satisfied with the statis and opportunities which were theirs before the war.

In recent years the radio and the movie had been potent, if sometimes double-edged, instruments of change. The one piece of furniture that seems to be present in homes of all types and classes. is the radio. The functions of town crier, village gossip, and court jester have all been taken over by this little box, which informs the people, with urgency, about the latest crisis in world affairs, the ways to get clothes three shades whiter, the fortunes and misfortunes of the Widow Perkins, and the horrible social consequences of body odor. The movie too draws entranced spectators of all ages and social conditions into its dark, cool interior where they absorb much misinformation about the Anglo culture as they watch the tribulations of true love, see victory snatched from the jaws of defeat, and thrill to the triumph of virtue over sin. Near the border and in cities where there is a large Spanish-speaking population, the radio programs are likely to be in Spanish and the movies to have been produced in Mexico or South America. When that is so, the movie and the radio become instruments for delaying rather than facilitating acculturation, since they multiply the opportunities for contacts with and experiences in non-Anglo cultural situations. It should be noted, however, that they are retarding factors in only one of the two general types of change with which we are concerned: i.e., the change from "Mexican" to Anglo culture. In the larger and more inclusive type of change, that from a folk to an urban - industrial condition, the movie and radio, since they provide impersonal, vicarious experience through the use of machines and in commercialized and formalized situations, are very influential instruments.

A third factor of importance in the social history of the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest in the past hundred years is urbanization. Indeed the whole history of what has taken place could almost be summed up in this one word. For, by almost any definition, the Spanish-speaking people of 1846 were a rural people; and, also by almost any definition, a very high proportion of these of 1949 are urban.

In 1850 Texas had only five towns with a population exceeding one thousand and none that contained as many as five thousand people. Los Angeles was a village of 1,600; San Antonio had fewer than 3,500 inhabitants. Not twenty-thousand people in the whole Southwest lived in towns as large as 2,500; not a single person in the Southwest, Anglo or Spanish-speaking, lived in a town that contained as many as five thousand people. By contrast, in 1940 Los Angeles alone had over one and a half million residents, and in the entire Southwest, there were nearly eight million people living in places classified as urban by the Bureau of the Census. More than two and a half million were concentrated in cities of over a hundred thousand. That the Spanish-speaking people have participated in this growing urbanization can be seen in the fact that nearly three quarters of the Spanish-speaking population of California live in or near Los Angeles; that there are a hundred thousand in or about San Antonio; that another hundred thousand are concentrated in Hidalgo county, Texas, the majority of whom live in the nine small cities along Highway 83; that there are sizeable numbers in Houston, Dallas, Denver, El Paso, Albuquerque, Tucson, and many of the smaller cities of the area.

The urbanization of the Southwest is a fairly recent phenomenon and its full significance for the Spanish-speaking people is not yet entirely known. As late as 1900 the region was still largely rural and the most rapid growing has taken place only within the past twenty or thirty years. As far as I know, no one has yet undertaken the task of exploring and recording the implications of urbanization for the Spanish-speaking people and its effects on the relations which have been developing between the English-and-Spanish-speaking groups in the area during the past hundred years. There is, however, no question but that the implications are many and the effects numerous and profound. The shift from a predominantly rural to a predominately urban population has been accompanied by rapid changes in the cultural patterns of the Spanish-speaking people and in those of the larger group of which they are a part. Birth and death rates have decreased; new patterns of family and community relations have developed. There are more divorces, and more intermarriage with members of the Anglo group. New economic relations and activities have appeared. There has been a decline in the use of Spanish and a change in the language itself as new concepts have been added and English words borrowed and adapted. The middle class has grown in size and importance. The realm of the scared has diminished; that of the secular has expanded. Changes have been made in the ceremonial calender--old holidays have lost significance; new ones have been added. There are more intra-group and inter-group tensions and conflicts.

Urbanization, among its other effects, has intensified the pressure toward acculturation. That pressure, however, has been somewhat minimized by the tendency of the Spanish-speaking people to live in separate sections of cities and towns and to maintain, insofar as possible, separate religious, educational, economic, and other institutions. This is an easily understandable kind of behavior and one that has been practiced by nearly every nationality group that has come to settle in the United States. In the case of most of the other groups immigration restrictions and other forces have made difficult the maintaining of separate institutions, and the various national minorities have been or are rapidly being assimilated into the general population. The situation of the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest is unique[18] in that their culture is constantly being reinforced by a stream of both legal and illegal immigrants and by the fact that they represent not an isolated cultural group, but the nothernmost tip of an Indo-Hispanic population numerically equal to or greater than that of the United States. Their growing urbanization and their position as a cultural peninsula place the Spanish-speaking Southwesterners in the enviable position of being able to participate in two great cultures and to take advantage of the best that each has to offer. There is already much evidence in many cities that they are beginning to exploit that opportunity.

---

[18] The French Candians who have settled in the north-eastern part of the United States may be considered an exception to this statement. But the French-Canadians come to the United States from a group that is a minority in Canada, whereas the Spanish-speaking come from areas where they are the culturally dominant group.

Up to the present time, the Spanish-speaking people have not fully participated in the benefits of urban-industrial living. Using almost any index of socio-economic status that might be constructed, the Spanish-speaking group will be found, on the average, to occupy a less desirable position than that of the population as a whole. They live in poorer and smaller houses, own less money, are more likely to be ill, enjoy fewer comforts, own less property, and have less schooling than the people among whom they live.[19] Their condition is the result of the interaction of many factors among which are the newness of many of them in the United States, their lack of familiarity with Anglo culture and with urban living, their tendency to live apart and maintain their own institutions whenever possible, the scarcity of social mechanisms to facilitate communications across ethnic lines, and, in some communities--happily becoming fewer in number--the existance of ethnic prejudice and discrimination which operate to erect an invisible curtain between Spanish-speaking and Anglo groups. These disadvantages, however, can be remedied, and there is already abundant evidence that the average social and economic status of the Spanish-speaking people is improving. More are finishing elementary and high schools;[20] more are attending and being graduated from colleges and universities.[21] More are becoming skilled workers and professionals. More are acquiring businesses and other roporty. And more are taking an intelligent interest and an active part in political affairs,[22] which, in a democratic society, is the most effective way for any group to improve its status.

---

[19] In 1930, for example, the latest year for which separate figures on the Spanish-speaking group are available, there were in the United States only 5,400 "Mexicans" in clerical jobs, 1,092 teachers, 93 lawyers and judges, and 165 physicians and surgeons. As late as 1945-46 there were only 799 Texas-born Spanish-name students in all the colleges and universities in Texas.

[20] A back to school drive carried on in South Texas last year by a group of young Spanish-speaking veterans was so successful that school administrators were somewhat embarrassed by the sudden influx of students whom they had not prepared for.

[21] The educational benefits granted by the government to war veterans had resulted in a vast increase in the number of Spanish-speaking students in universities. Figures compiled by the Study of Spanish-speaking people of the University of Texas show that there were four or five times as many Spanish-name students in Texas colleges and universities in 1948-49 as there were in the academic year 1945-46.

[22] Until recently New Mexico was the only state in which the Spanish-speaking group was politically potent. Within the past year or two there has been increasing political activity on the part of the Spanish-speaking persons and groups in Texas which has led to the election of Spanish-name persons in areas where only Anglos had held office for the past hundred years. There are indications that political leadership is developing and that the Spanish-speaking group will become increasingly important in political affairs.

Stated in sociological terms, what is happening in the Southwest now is that the English-and Spanish-speaking groups are moving toward new levels of accommodation. Old relationships can no longer be maintained. Old adjustments are found to be unsatisfactory. In such a process conflicts of interest always arise and tensions and social strains are produced. Much of the present troubled situation in Texas and elsewhere in the Southwest is merely evidence that the pattern of accomodation is changing rapidly and that the Spanish-speaking group is moving toward and will certainly attain new status levels. When the new adjustment has worked out, the differences between the two groups will be less than they are now, the rate of change of both will be more nearly the same, and the present tensions and strains, insofar as they are the result of shifting patterns of accommodation, will tend to disappear.

The Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest, like all the rest of us, have come a long way in the past hundred years. The changes they have undergone can be dramatically symbolized in terms of contrasts: the thatch-roofed hut and the skyscraper; the horse-drawn wagon and the stratocruiser; the wooden hoe and the mechanical cotten picker; the corrido singer and the juke box; the open fireplace and the atomic pile. The social distance they have traversed is greater than that between the most isolated village in New Mexico and the heart of downtown San Antonio. They have not all moved at the same rate, nor are they at the same point now. But they are all upon the same road and moving in the same direction. And there will be no turning back.

Austin, Texas
July, 1949

THE SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE OF THE SOUTHWEST*

by Lyle Saunders**

1. Heterogeneity of the group:

The Spanish-speaking population of the Southwest is not a homogeneous group but is made up of several sub-groups with somewhat differing biological and cultural characteristics. Among the more important of the sub-groups are: the Spanish-Americans, descendants of families that have lived in the Southwest for several hundred years; Mexican-Americans, native-born descendants of families who have migrated from Mexico, largely since 1910; and Mexicans, citizens of Mexico, many of whom have entered the United States illegally.

Biological differences among members of these three groups result from the continued intermixture with Indian groups that has been going on in Mexico since the Conquest, the endogamous nature of Spanish-American communities during the past 100 years, and the increasing intermarriage between Spanish-speaking and English-speaking (Anglos) that has been going on in the past 15 to 20 years.

Cultural differences result from variations in the amount of contact with Anglo culture; differences in class status of individuals or families; sub-cultural variations between urban and rural people--in short from the differing school experiences of the three groups. (The range of both cultural and biological variation within each group is greater than that between groups.)

The three groups might be characterized thus: Spanish-Americans have been largely a stable, land-owning people, until recently quite self reliant and self sufficient, who are now facing rapid social change and the resulting possibility of social and personal disorganization; Mexican-Americans, being first and second generation immigrants, are undergoing the unsettling transition from Mexican to American ways and values; the Mexicans are largely poor, landless males with few possessions, little education, few skills and almost no understanding of the United States and its ways.

---

*Paper presented at 4th annual workshop in Cultural Relations, Denver, May 5, 1958.

**Associate Professor of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, University of Colorado, School of Medicine.

It is virtually impossible to find a set of criteria for precisely defining members of the Spanish-speaking group; yet they are an easily distinguishable population whose physical and social characteristics set them apart and who tend to interact more with each other than the rest of the population.

2. *Historical backgrounds*:

Spanish-speaking people first came into the Southwest in the 16th century. In the latter part of that century and throughout the 17th, settlements were established in the Rio Grande Valley north from El Paso to what is now southern Colorado. Settlements were of two kinds: isolated *rancheros* and *haciendas* (owned by a *hacendado*, staffed by soldier-citizens, and worked by peons) and *village communities*, clusters of several extended families supporting themselves by subsistence agriculture. Perhaps the most important factor in the history of these settlements was *isolation*: until the early 19th century they had almost no contact with the main stream of Western Civilization.

Outstanding *events in the breakdown of isolation were*: the coming of a small group of individual traders, trappers, mountain men in the period 1800-1830; the development of trade with the east and the opening of the Santa Fe trail, 1830-1860; the gold rush to California in the 1850's; the conquest of the area by the United States in 1846; the coming of the railroad, 1870-1880; a period of intensive homesteading by Anglos, 1910-1920; and the first World War, 1914-1918.

Among the *effects of these events* were: the introduction of a new type of government; a new legal system which enabled sharp dealing Anglos to acquire much land from the villagers; a new language, religion, technology; the introduction of wage work and a money economy; the psychological imperatives; the need to adjust to change, the appearance of competition and aggression, the expectation of individual responsibility.

Two *main streams of change* can be noted: the change from a rural-folk to an urban-industrial culture; and change in the direction of the adoption of specific Anglo cultural elements (e.g., the English language, Protestant religion, mechanized technology, democratic government, etc.)

A *folk culture*, such as the Spanish-Americans developed, has these characteristics which are almost exactly opposite those of an urban-industrial culture: small population aggregations in which typically everybody knows everybody else; a high degree of isolation from other cultures; communication by oral rather than by written symbols, with little communication of any kind outside the immediate group, a homogenous population with but little division of labor; a slow rate of social change; a simple technology; economic independence and a sub-sistence economy; a strong sense of group identification; a predominance of sacred, as opposed to secular, symbols and sanctions. The attitudes, values, and character structure of members of the group reflect this folk background.

Recent events that have influenced the rate of social and cultural change among the Spanish-speaking have been: the depression of the 1930's which brought the first large scale governmental attempts to meet the problems of the Spanish-speaking and introduced a pattern of dependency on impersonal agencies to replace the older custom of patron dependency; the second World War which, through the draft and war work opportunities took many Spanish-Americans out of their villages; the G.I. Bill of Rights which enabled many Spanish-speaking men and women to attend college; urbanization, which is bringing Spanish speaking people, historically rural, into cities in ever increasing numbers; the invasion of hundreds of thousands of illegal wetbacks from Mexico whose presence tends to retard acculturation and to help perpetuate discriminatory attitudes and prejudices on the part of Anglos.

3. Numbers and distribution:

The 1950 Census tabulated about 2,300,000 Spanish-name persons in the five Southwestern states--11% of the total population. For a number of reasons this count is thought somewhat low. The highest numbers are in Texas (1,033,000); the smallest numerical group in Colorado (118,000). The highest proportion is in New Mexico (36.5% of the total population; the smallest in California (7.2%). The Texas, California, and Arizona populations are largely Mexican-Americans and Mexicans; those of Colorado and New Mexico are largely Spanish-Americans, although Colorado has a considerable number of Mexican-Americans and Mexicans among its migrant labor population. The Denver Spanish-speaking population is about 25,000 to 30,000, nearly all of whom are Spanish-American.

Population distribution is uneven. In some New Mexico and Texas counties, Spanish-name people make up 80-90% of the total population. In some counties there are none. Three counties (Texas and California) have over 100,000 each; three others have more than 50,000. In general, one can observe a gradual gradient of decrease in both numbers and proportions as one moves northward from border counties.

Demographic trends that can be noted include: increasing numbers as a result of both rapid natural increase and high immigration (largely illegal) from Mexico; a general northward movement of Spanish-speaking people out of border areas and their replacement by new migrants from Mexico; increasing urbanization. (Two-thirds of the total Spanish-name population of the Southwest now live in cities.)

4. Social characteristics

Wherever they are found in the Southwest, the Spanish-speaking people, as a group, are characterized by: low incomes; limited education, with relatively few of the middle and older age adults having completed more than over six years of school; a high proportion of workers in low paying, blind alley jobs; a higher death rate (especially among infants) and morbidity rate (at least for contagious and infectious diseases) than the population as a whole; segregated residential areas, and in some parts of the Southwest separate churches, business facilities, schools.

Other social characteristics include: an extended family system, with a strong sense of family solidarity (this breaks down rather rapidly in cities); a tendency towards marriage within the group; considerable physical mobility; restricted social mobility; Catholic religious faith; and a pervasive belief in witches and witchcraft.

After a century of contact with Anglo culture many of the traits of Spanish-speaking group persists. The rate of acculturation is slower than it might otherwise be because of both voluntary and imposed segregation (which limits opportunities for meaningful contacts between Anglos and the Spanish-speaking) and because of cultural reinforcement from Mexico.

5. Class variations within the Spanish-speaking group:

There are no good studies of the class status or characteristics of the Spanish-speaking. There are three status systems within which the Spanish-American group may move: the village status system; the system of Spanish-speaking people on a state or regional level: the Anglo system on a state or regional level. In general, a Spanish-American might be expected to lose from a half to a full class level as he moves outward from home village to Anglo city.

Among the differences which have been noted (mainly immpressionistically) among the various class levels are:

Village lower class: pre-Anglo social system with large reliance on family, church, patron, community: little English spoken or known; poor economic status with abobe houses, small land holdings, unskilled occupations, much relief; older people illiterate, and children seldom going beyond elementary school; penitente religion; some suspicion of and hostility toward Anglos; tendency to live largely in and for the present.

Urban-surburban lower class (middle classof village): Catholic religion, with some penitente membership; participation in the values and customs of the old culture, but with some uneven acculturation; some English used outside the home; low income, unskilled work, high proportion of relief recipients; illiteracy among older people; children in school through elementary grades with some attending and finishing highschool; envy and emulation of Anglos; resentment of felt lack of acceptancy by Anglos; tendency to live largely in and for the present.

Urban-surburban lower-middle class (upper in village): religion, Catholic, with rare protestants, extended family pattern still strong, but with some trend towards adoption of Anglo family pattern; English known, but not largely used in home; fairly good economic status; older people uneducated in formal sense, but children attend high school and sometimes college; admiration and emulation of Anglos; resentment of cultural barriers; some tendency towards glorification of "good old days".

Urban-surburban upper-middle class (upper in village): both Catholic and Protestant with some deliberate acceptance of Protestantism to be more like Anglos; social system of somewhat sophisticated mixture of both Spanish and Anglo elements, with young people generally accepting Anglo middle class ideals; language mainly English, but Spanish is known by adults; good economic status; fairly high educational level, with frequent college attendance by young people; idealization and practice of Anglo traits, to extent that there exists an almost unbridgeable gap between this class and lower Spanish-speaking; much more interaction with each other and with Anglos than with lower classes among Spanish-speaking; orientation to time, work, success not much different from that of Anglos.

Urban-surburban upper class: mainly Catholic; social system much like that of Anglos, but with emphasis on kinship relations within own group; some deliberate, sophisticated cultivating and preserving of Spanish cultural elements; language mainly English with Spanish known as a point of pride; very good economic status; high level of formal education; feelings of superiority towards Anglos, but much adoption of Anglo ways and values; some tendency to glorify the past.

Denver population is probably made up largely of urban-suburban lower and lower middle class members. There are relatively few of village lower class group; a thin layer of upper middle (very probably increasing in numbers; very few, if any, upper class.)

6. Some value orientation patterns of the Spanish-speaking group: (these are group generalizations, that may or may not be seen in the behavior of a given individual).

Extended family group: "To be a Spanish-American is to be a brother". Family (and by extension community) membership is the basis for one's self identification. The family, not the individual, is the important unit, and individuals are expected to subordinate own interests to those of family. Family, on the other hand, is expected to be loyal and responsible for its members. Children are positively desired; attitudes towards them are warm, permissive, but children are never the center of attention. Sibling relationships are generally those of affection, companionship, interdependence; the absence of strong sibling rivalry has been commented on by several students of the group. In its external relationships the family is patriarchal, with females being expected to confine themselves to their traditional tasks of caring for the household, bearing and rearing children. In its internal relationships, the families are frequently mother-centered. Visiting and hospitality between relatives is very common; children are "loaned" to childless couples within the larger family group.

Sense of time: Anglos are oriented toward the future, Spanish-speaking toward the present. The clock and the calendar are not important gadgets for Spanish-speaking. In their culture major emphasis is on the present. The past is not venerated; the future is vaguely conceived, is sometimes a source of a generalized uneasiness. Activities are largely unplanned; gatherings of people tend to be spontaneous. The impulse of the moment is a strong determinant of behavior. That which is pleasant or necessary is done; that which is neither is put off. The differences in orientation to time leads many Anglos to characterize Spanish-speaking as irresponsible, lazy, undependable; it has been a barrier to the developing of sympathetic understanding between members of the two groups.

Sense of modesty: Generally speaking, Spanish-speaking persons are likely to be more sensitive to violations of modesty than are Anglos of comparable class levels. There may be reluctance to talk about bodily functions or organs in mixed groups, some reluctance to talk about one's body even to persons of the same sex. Sex tends not to be a topic of conversation, except possibly among all-male groups in which there is boasting of sexual prowess or accomplishments. A physical examination may be a trying experience for a Spanish-speaking person, especially if performed by one of the opposite sex.

Individualism: Competitive individualism is highly valued by Anglos. There is competition for almost everything; there is insistence that the individual is largely responsible for his own destiny, for "getting ahead", for "making something of himself." The Spanish-speaking is also an individualist, but his tends to be an individualism of being rather than doing, of recognition of personal characteristics rather than of accomplishment. The Anglo takes pride in what he does; the Spanish-speaking in what he is.

Achievement and success: Laski: "Few Americans are happy unless they are doing something". The Anglo says in effect: "Let's do something about it!"; the Spanish-speaking, "Let's accept it and adjust to it." The Anglo glorifies progress, believes it essential and inevitable; the Spanish-speaking person is more likely to be content with things as they are. The widely differing group attitudes are reflected in the relative emphasis on institutional and personal leadership in the two cultures; in the differing emphases on ascribed and achieved status; in the differing degrees to which group members feel impelled to make changes in their environment (in nearly two hundred years of isolation, there were almost no changes in the Spanish-American villages). Achievement and success are high Anglo values; they are much less highly valued among Spanish-speaking.

Activity and work: Anglos emphasize work, sometimes to the extent of seeming to advocate work for work's sake. They equate idleness and sinfulness. Employment has meaning beyond the economic return. For Anglos a satisfactory answer to the question: "Who is he?" is to tell what he does. The Spanish-speaking does not idealize work. For him it is a necessary evil, something to do because it has to be done, but something to get over with as quickly and pleasantly as possible. Idleness is not morally corrupting; the "job" does not rank high in the scale of values. Certainly one is not expected to structure his life around an occupation. Obligations to friends or family members may take precedence over obligations to an employer.

Efficiency and practicality: Both are emphasized by Anglos, sometimes to the point where they become ends in themselves. The Spanish-speaking value both fairly low. In Spanish-American villages in 150 years agricultural techniques changed scarcely at all. There was no drive for improvement, little or no questioning of whether or not methods were efficient. Practicality, of course, is related to other values: it is regarded as 'practical' by Anglos to "save for a rainy day"; it is 'practical' for a Spanish-speaking family on relief to buy a TV set so they can enjoy today.

Reliance on science and secular rationality: The generalized Anglo attitude has been well expressed by Clyde and Florence Kluckholn: "Our glorification of science and our faith in what can be accomplished through education are two striking aspects of our generalized conviction that secular, humanistic effort will improve the world in a series of changes, all for the better." Applied science is highly valued in Anglo culture as a tool for controlling nature (and now, man) and science, which is rational, systematic, diligent, functional, efficient, fits in well with our other value orientations. The Spanish-speaking people are more likely to see themselves as victims or benefittors of forces that are supernatural, animistic, magical, whimsical, and quite beyond their power to control. Succinctly: Anglos tend to think, reason, control; the Spanish-speaking to feel, conform, accept.

Health and sickness: "Better health" for the individual or community is not a Spanish-speaking group concept. The Spanish-speaking person considers himself a whole person who does not have to improve himself in this respect. Illness and discomfort are a part of living; one accepts them as he accepts other unpleasant aspects of life. If they are minor, they can be ignored or complained about. If they are such as to interfere with normal activities family resources can be summoned for aid.

The sick person does not withdraw from the group. Rather he is more closely surrounded by the group, who are obligated to help him and support him. Some illness can be caused by the malevolent powers of other persons; ritual precautions can sometimes prevent such harm. Harm comes from the physical world, form the unknown, from evil persons. It cannot come from one's relatives and friends. Surgery may cause irreparable damage: "An operation is as if you take a clay pot, drop it on the ground and crack it; you pick it up and patch it and you still have a pot, but one less useful than an undamaged one."

7. *Personality characteristics*: Gordon Hewes has made a composite listing of the characteristics of Mexicans as revealed in Mexican literature. Among the characteristics noted are these:

1. Deep feelings of inferiority or insufficiency--as reflected in cruelty to animals and inferiors, quick preception of insult, easily wounded pride, withdrawer from unpleasant or potentially damaging situations.

2. Individualism--an insistence on one's personal worth or competence; the lack of team spirit, inability to organize for promoting common ends.

3. Passivity, punctuated by violence or verbal outbursts. (Mexico has a very high homicide rate)

4. General irritability/ lightened by "occasional tenderness and delicacy".

5. *Machismo*, the need of males to maintain the fiction of enormous virility.

6. Preoccupation with violence and death, as reflected in realistic and gruesome detail in religious images, the celebrations of the Day of the Dead, fantasies of sainthood, the detail with which deaths and accidents are reported in newspapers, the elaboration of funeral rites, the popularity of bull fighting.

7. Religious ambivalence; religious apathy, skepticism, nonattendance in a country noted for the profusion of its churches.

8. Acceptance of a double standard of sexual morality, with sharply opposed codes of conduct for males and females.

9. Great concern with personal honor, manifest in extreme sensitivity to insult, the formalization of relationships, the elaborate use of titles and such conventions and handshaking, national chauvinism.

10. Micromania, reflected in a preoccupation with small art and handcraft objects, diminutives and superdiminutives in speech, liking for children and little animals.

11. Attitudes of fatalism and acceptance.

12. Imaginative vivacity, seen in exuberant architecture, a high level of artistic creativity.

13. Sentimentality, introversion, indecision, vagueness in notions of time and space, inability to arrive at positive conclusions.

In relations between any Anglo and any Spanish-speaking person there may be cultural barriers to understanding and communication that operate to limit the effectiveness of the relationship for achieving whatever ends either of the actors has in mind. An awareness that these barriers may exist is a first step towards minimizing their influence. The purpose of this outline is to call attention to some of the areas where cultural differences may exist and to suggest by implications the desirability of making allowance for them when communication across cultural lines is attempted.

3/10/58

CULTURE PATTERNS OF THE SPANISH SPEAKING COMMUNITY

by Dr. Arthur L. Campa*

The subject which I have chosen to discuss with you this afternoon is "Culture Patterns of the Spanish Speaking Community," but before I go any further I should like to define what I mean by culture and what segment of the Spanish speaking community we are concerned herewith. We have pooled our resources in this workshop in order to help each other understand a little more fully the process of acculturation, a process which in time will ameliorate some of the problems which are faced by those who work directly with the Spanish speaking community.

It may be easier to comprehend this process if from the onset we make a distinction between civilization and culture and study the relation which one bears to the other. This dichotomy may be wholy arbitrary on my part, although it has been drawn before, but it is justified particularly when dealing with two cultures, one with a material practical orientation and another one with a subjective personalized tendency. For the purpose of this discussion we can assume that the United States is the most civilized country in the modern world, that is, it has the greatest amount of such material things as cars, paved highways, bathtubs, central heating, museums, libraries, schools and spring matresses. When these products of our civilization are properly implemented and utilized they help to raise the level of our culture.

Allow me to use a very prosaic example by way of illustration. We have produced an endless list of cleansing agents for every conceivable purpose, everything from soaps, detergents which caress milady's lovely hands, scouring powders, dove-smooth facial concoctions, to shampoos which make us desirable and Z-E-S-T.

Our engineers have also piped water into every home and provided them with washbowls, tubs, showers and sinks of every shape, color and hue to satisfy the most whimsical taste. All this, I believe, is part of our civilization, a commodity which we have in great profusion. When these cleansing agents are properly utilized by our society they createvveny definite habits and attitudes towards cleanliness and sanitation, and in turn establish higher standards which we consider norms for that part of our culture which is related to cleanliness and sanitation. The result is that the degree to which one's hands, ears, clothing and homes are free from dirt and tattletale grey becomes an index to our level of culture and we end up by expecting spotless-white-sheets, bleached furniture, white bread and white skin which to tan in the Florida sun.

---

*Chairman, Department of Modern Foreign Languages, University of Denver.

Another example, if I may. We have numerous libraries with untold quantities of informative and self-improving literature, yet we shall not be well informed nor well-read until we make proper use of these culture-producing facilities provided by our civilization. What I am trying to say, seriously is that the mere possession of a great civilization does not necessarily make us a highly cultured nation. The implementation of our civilization resources can and does broaden our thinking, makes us more universally-minded, lessons our provincialism and in a sense acculturates us to a universal concept of life. If this were not so, schools would have no meaning.

The process of acculturation has been going on on this continent from the day when the first European set foot on it. In fact, what may be considered the first American culture trait, resulting from this intercontinental contact, and its beginning when Columbus landed on the island of Hispaniola in 1492. Today the use of the commodity which he discovered has grown into a cultural practice which is variously considered a filthy habit, a source of delightful enjoyment for those who wish to live modern, a substantial economic asset for southern Colonels, a leading industry, a handy prop for awkward hands, a means of acquiring wives in the cradle of American aristocracy and the lifeblood of some of our leading universities as well as the suspected and much debated cause of lung-cancer.

To continue further with the process, every time we eat a potato, candy, a yam, serve pumpkin or squash, crack a peanut, eat corn on or off the cob, warm our insides with a hot tamale or drink a cup of Aztec invented chocolate we are indulging in cultural practices which we as displaced Europeans acquired from the inhabitants of the new world, albeit the fact that most of these very savory cultural practices were passed on to North-American immigrants by the earlier arrived and acculturated Hispanic settlers. When we listen to the opera, when we dance to a rhumba, a samba, the cha cha cha, or for that matter jazz, when we sing "Silent Night", when we eat smorgasbord, when we prepare a dish of spaghetti or chop suey, when we put on a sombrero and chaps, when we play the guitar and lasso a steer we are still paying homage to culture sources from whence we derived some of the content which has blended into the pattern of American life.

Here in Denver, in a small but very important corner of the U.S. we are concerned with the process of acculturation, and there may be some of us who shudder at the work, thinking that it is a cancerous growth that must be removed before it consumes us by its malignant effects. Our faces grow long and apprehensive when we think about it, just like our European ancestors centuries cringed at the thought of biting into a "poisonous" tomato or an "evil looking" potato. Acculturation as such is not a problem but a process, retarded, much to our dismay, by certain conditions and attitudes which we are attempting to study in this workshop.

Our problem would be a lot simpler if the culture lines were clearly drawn and we could consider Spanish culture exclusively, rather than making an analysis of the culture patterns of the Spanish speaking community. I say it would be simpler because Spanish culture would provide us with a complete society where the developmental process would run its full range from the lowest rung of the cultural ladder to the highest. As it is, we are dealing with a community which represents only a segment of a full society, a very complex segment which is not homogenous biologically nor historically, a folk-culture which lacks some of the units of the value system present in a normally complete society. This is a factor which is often neglected in dealing with the Spanish speaking community. When we bank American society against the folk culture of this community we do not come up with meaningful answers to our questions.

This lack of a value system is inescapably the result in a community which is composed to a large extent of people who have lost or who never acquired a complete cultural identity in the culture in which they were born, because of displacement at an early age, because of economic deficiencies, because of being out of contact with their original culture, or because of lack of education. Under such conditions they cannot be expected to represent Spanish culture in a consistent pattern, nor can they wholly represent Spanish society because they are the product of a folk, traditional culture. Having grown up outside of the culture which bestowed upon them the name Spanish, they have not formed the normal attitudes of Hispanic people.

Moreover, there may be certain traits in their folk behavior which are either autochthonous or the result of the mixed Spanish Indian culture of the Southwest and of Mexico with virtues and vices from both. Again, the lack of a directed cultural flow arises to some extent from the fact that a good proportion of the Spanish speaking residents in Denver lost their sense of belonging when they were uprooted from their original heimat, and the society, American society, in which they now live lacks for them the personal relationships to which they were accustomed in village life or in the country.

A good number of traits and practices which are attributed to the Spanish heritage of Spanish speaking people here and in the Southwest generally, are in reality traits that one would expect to find in the folk culture of any nation. As a consequence the intermediary step called for is one of urbanization pure and simple. In actuality this is what we are saying when we recommend that the Spanish speaking community acquire more technical competence, that they become more oriented towards institutional and collective living, that they accept and adapt to the change instituted by progress, that they develop acquisitiveness, that they base their behavior on principle rather than on custom and that they manifest a greater faith in formal education. To the degree that they move in the direction pointed out by these objectives they become urbanized. In the process of integrating the Spanish speaking community with American society the conversion of folk culture mores is an essential and indispensable step. In other words, solids must be converted into liquids in order to produce a blend. The Social Sciences Research Council pointed out the importance of this cultural equality in the acculturation process by saying:

> "Acculturation may be taken to refer to the ways in which some cultural aspect is taken into a culture and adjusted and fitted to it. *This implies some relative cultural equality between the giving and the receiving cultures*." (Italics are mine.)

In other words, the cultural groups involved should be in an essentially reciprocal relationship. If both cultures are going to give and take there must be first this approximation of cultural level. The process will be gradual but it can be accomplished just as it has been already accomplished by individual members of the Spanish speaking community who have been properly oriented either through effective counseling or through their own efforts. An educated Spaniard or Latin American does not need to go through this process because he is already within the societal level which he represents and his acculturation is simply a translation of his culture into terms understandable to American society. The conversion suggested by the Research Council and alluded to in this paper does not mean that the Spanish speaking community is going to lose its identity. The only way to lose complete identity is through assimilation, but this is a biological process, which is bound to occur though not as completely as it occurred in England in 1066 and in Spain during the visigothic invasions is one which need not trouble us. When the process of integration sets in, once the foregoing conditions have been met, it is valid to consider what is being adopted by both groups and why, as we hope will be done by the panel discussion at the end of the workshop.

The culture of the Spanish speaking community, existing as it does within a dominant urban culture, is lacking in the culturally approved rules and sentiments which motivate overt behavior and integrate into consistent patterns. The patterns of covert behavior followed when dealing with and in the society of their own Spanish speaking folk kinship are much more uniform. Actually what we have is two types of behavior, one used in attempting to conform to the dominant culture, and sometimes frowned upon by the minority culture, and the one which they find more satisfying because it is more natural used in intimate personal relationships, and in familiar situations. This ambivalence is likely to give the outsider the impression that Spanish speaking people are hostile to American culture, that they are retrogressive and highly conservative. True, there is a noticeable resistance to the dominant culture, but not for the reasons generally ascribed. In addition to being of a different national origin, the dominant culture is being presented at a level which the average Spanish speaking person has not yet attained and cannot therefore assimilate. Notice for example the rural American in his relations with an equally rural Spanish speaking person, both products of a folk culture, and you will find a greater affinity despite the fact they they may speak a different language.

In attempting to lay bare the warp and woof of the cultural patterns of Spanish speaking people, we shall discover that the community is composed, not of one people but of several groups of people coming into the Southwest and into Denver at different times and from different places. This produces a heterogenity which retards the process of acculturation. The Spanish speaking colonial was taken into the fold of American culture more through connivance and chicancery than through military conquest. As a result he does not consider himself an outsider in a part of the continent which he helped to conquer and settle 250 years before being transformed into an American citizen. There is a slight feeling, when aroused, that the bearers of Anglo-American culture are intruders in the sun.

The second group consists of Mexican political refugees who started coming into the U.S. at the turn of the century and continued to come until the early twenties. This is a heterogeneous group, culturally and economically speaking. The vast majority were laborers unable to earn a living in a revolution torn country, but there were also a good number of tradesmen such as tailors, shoemakers, barbers, painters, carpenters and masons who had little difficulty in plying their trades in New Mexico where there was a relative scarcity of skilled laborers among the Spanish speaking inhabitants. A cursory survey in the city of Albuquerque as recent as 1930 revealed that ninety percent to the tailors, barbers, and shoemakers were Mexican nationals. There was also a sprinkling of professionals whose presence was not noticeable because they circulated in the levels of society commensurate with their profession and had no trouble in blending with the population. One of these, a school teacher by the name of Octaviano Larrazolo went into politics and became governor of New Mexico in 1919.

The third group is composed principally of laborers attracted and contracted by the cotton fields, fruit ranches, and the sugar beet industry. Except for the depression years, when more went back to Mexico than entered the U.S., this Spanish speaking group continued to increase for a number of years and because of their unfamiliarity with American culture, their lack of training and education plus the fact that they are the most recent to arrive, the gulf between their folk culture and American urban society is much more difficult to bridge.

There is a considerable degree of Indian in one Spanish speaking community, more in the laborer group recently come from Mexico and to a much less degree among the professionals and tradesmen already referred to. The Indian element in the Spanish speaking colonials was assimilated during the initial period of contact as in the case of Anglo-American pioneers, but the process of Hispanization has been so uniform that whole villages have lost their Indian identity and have become wholly Spanish speaking. Today it is difficult to gauge the degree of Indian blood in the colonials and it is unimportant, except for whatever culture content and traits the indigenous inhabitants may have contributed to the pattern of Hispanic culture. In the case of the landed Spanish speaking New Mexican there was little difficulty in blending with the American newcomers once the initial resentment died down, and before long they began sending their children to the schools in St. Louis instead of Mexico City and Chihuahua. As is to be expected this segment of the Spanish speaking colonial society does not enter into our considerations any more than the professional group, limited though it may be, because such people are busy attending to their own affairs whether it be politics, ranching, mining, business or the professions. Moreover, many of them are no longer Spanish speaking and are only so when they learn the language in school.

As stated before, the Spanish speaking community now under consideration consists of a folk culture within the aegis of American society. In addition to those configurations which are attributable to the folk, the community has others which are Spanish, and others yet which may be the result of a mixed heritage. It must be reiterated, at the expense of being repetitious, that the Denver community does not possess all the configurations of the Spanish cultural pattern because a folk culture does not have the full range of a complete society. Individuals who have emerged f from this folk culture and have reached the professional level of American society have not done so through Spanish channels but through the avenues provided by the society into which they have been integrated. Within the folk pattern of the community of Spanish speaking people there are traits which characterize Hispanic people the world over. These traits are consistently found today in Spain, throughout Latin America and to a varying degree in Denver as well. The mostbasic of these traits is passion. Passion in this sense means the subjective feeling which acts as a trigger to Spanish temperament, the motivating force which underlies action, thinking, and life in general. It is something profoundly personal, individualistic and completely detached from a practical and an organized course of action. It is a motivating force which leads to both extremes, and like force in any form, it is capable of good or evil, it can love, it can be tender or it can be vicious and kill.

This purely subjective urge seldom leads to cooperative effort, and for that reason is hardly ever conducive to civic mindedness in Spanish speaking communities. Madariaga, the leading Spanish internationalist puts it quite aptly:

> "The individual psychology of the man of passion implies a nature rebellious to the chains of collective life."

The man of passion is not guided by the utilitarian or practical standards of the man of action and relies on the dictates of his inner self for whatever he does, with the result that the self acquires an importance which borders on egocentricity and produces an out-and-out individualist. This individualism oriented by the dictates of self-concience

in the language by saying: "No me da la gana!" It doesn't mean I don't want to but the feeling doesn't move me to do so. Spanish individualism is a defense against the incursion of collectivity and keeps the ego from being fenced in. This is partly the reason why Spanish speaking people are particularly deficient in those social qualities which are based on collective standards. By their tendency to resist association they can achieve a measure of freedom, that is, freedom from social pressure, and this feeling helps to explain the contradictory tendencies of Spanish speaking people.

Humanism is another well known trait of Spanish speaking peoples, but when analyzed it will appear more as a form of generalized individualism resulting oftentimes in personalism. This personalism is apparent in politics, in the interpretation of justice, in making decisions where others are involved and in choosing a course of action. An individual fails to observe a law and feels perfectly justified in doing so because the law doesn't fit his personal sense of justice. If a grievance or even a crime has been committed against an individual he feels that he should take care of the situation personally. The intervention of institutionalized justice represented by a policeman is inimical to him and so he refuses to give any information which would deprive him of the personal satisfaction of settling his own affairs through a personal rather than institutional means.

In politics and in community leadership a person stands out, not for his virtues of collective representation but because he is a personality. Politicians thrive on this man-to-man relationship and do not use issues and platforms when results are to be obtained. The inclination to progress, to self-improvement, to change and to carry through an action to a successful conclusion are, as Mr. Saunders pointed out, characteristics of American society and the result of actions stimulated by objective efforts which do not appeal to Spanish speaking people. Being oriented by passion and subjectivity they lack continuity and perseverance in attaining the same ends as the men of action, and their line of activity results in a series of fitful starts and new beginnings. The sudden explosions to which the man of passion is susceptible can take him, however, to great heights of accomplishment, not by the continuity of his actions but by the force and impetus of his momentary passion. This was what enabled the conquerors to achieve unbelievable successes against odds which a man of action with his objectivity would have shunned. This is the reason why Spanish speaking people are outstanding in sports where outbursts of individual energy are the prime requirement. Notice the number of top ranking tennis players from Mexico, Peru and Ecuador. Also notice how inconsistent a bullfighter can be--at times he is prodigious and at times terrible. The crowds reward him accordingly and without seeking excuses. These personal achievements are in contradistinction to the man of collective enterprises whose successes are not only his but those of all about him. Washington is not a man alone but the U. S., on the other hand, Cortes is not Spain but simply Cortes.

There exists also a moral principal among Spanish speaking people which is involved in most of their actions and which is a natural by-product of a culture that feels, and has therefore a strong sense of being, whatever the being may be. In English we are likely to hear the expression: "Who does he think he is! or He thinks he is somebody." The counterpart in Spanish is "Soy quien soy y ni al Diablo me parezco." It doesn't matter who the person may be, the important think is that he is himself, an inviolable being who has attained the distinction of being by the mere fact that he is alive. He may be denied the right to do, and will not resent it too much provided that a course of action is not denied because of what he is, tall or short, blonde or brunette, elegant or careless. In the U. S. we are all granted the right to do but the right of being was not incorporated into the lawbooks. When society denies a course of action or the enjoyment of certain privileges to a Spanish speaking person because of what and who he is, he will invariably turn against the society which has injured his "self" and probably commit excesses. A blow directed at his being injures his honor his amor propio. This wounding of his pride of self, which gives an outsider the impression of being "touchy", can not be rectified by an apology because neither the word nor the practice exist in Spanish, nor can it be settled by compromise because there is no word for another practice which also does not exist. The only recourse is personalism, an individualistic approach which in Latin America is settled by a duel as we have seen by the papers recently.

Another trait which keeps law enforcement agencies on the run is one which is more pronounced among Spanish speaking individuals recently arrived from Mexico. It is a defense mechanism not found anywhere in Spain, and resorted to in the Spanish speaking community in order to offset the criticism which considers an individual inferior from a material viewpoint. This trait, called "machismo", is untranslatable into English, and linguistically is derived from the Spanish word for male, Macho. In a sense it is an undue emphasis on maleness, artificially induced by overt acts comparable to those of the gunslinger elbowing his way to the bar in TV shows. It is a means of calling attention to the self, a way of flattering the ego and gain stature, if successful, in the society of friends and enemies. It is not manliness, because it is provocative, and it has the primitiveness of the beast whereby the

the animalistic tendencies of the male seeks to prove, to his own satisfaction, that he is "muy mancho." The unfortunate feature of this type of dramatized virility is that unlike an upsurge of vital energy, it cannot be channeled into useful energy of work. It is an end in itself. I will mention in passing the element of time-perspective, a fundamental element in the Spanish cultural pattern, but I will not enlarge upon it because it has already been explained at length in the article entitled MANANA IS TODAY included into your packet. Suffice it to say that there is a marked tendency among Spanish speaking peoples to move forward with their backs to the future because of being oriented by a present-past relationship in which the future does not figure in their thinking until it arrives. You will observe while traveling in Latin America or Spain that the distances in the highway are given from the point of issue and not to the point ahead so that you can usually tell how far you have gone from a given point but not how far you have to go to reach your destination ahead.

Another part of the cultural pattern in Latin American culture, and I say Latin American advisedly because this culture trait is not found in Spain, is negative self-assertiveness. There is a tendency among certain individuals in the Spanish speaking community to assert themselves quite violently against a situation they don't approve of, against a person they dislike, or against a society by which they may have been wronged. This attitude gives the impression that they are carrying a chip on their shoulder and are overtly looking for trouble. In the highly personalized thinking of such individuals is harbored the conviction that the grievance, whatever it may be, can be settled only by them. Instead of fighting for something, they seem to be fighting against something. This form of protest often is a serious obstacle to cultural integration because attention is being drawn to such individuals as dissatisfied members of society and are considered anti-social. The situation somewhat comparable to that of the housewife who does housecleaning because she HATES dirt. In the dirt-fighting, dirt-hating process she loses sight of the positive end result and when finished is too exhausted to enjoy the fruit of her labors because she was motivated by a negative impulse. The one who cleans house because she loves cleanliness will enjoy the anticipation of her accomplishment and will be happy in the cleaning process and at the end. This negative selfassertiveness, I might add, seems to dissipate when the individual finds a positive course of action for his energies.

As a result of the highly underscored subjectivism, individualism or personalism, there is a tendency among Spanish speaking people to disassociate themselves from material things, or at least to keep this association to a minimum. Money, for example, is something to part with rather than something to keep, as a result most Spanish speaking people live beyond their income. There is little attachment to personal property, and will share it with others even though it be the last thing they own. John Steinbeck portrays this quite well in TORTILLA FLAT. This attitude toward material things is called in Spanish deprendimiento. "unattachment." The man who hoards his money is always looked upon with suspicion, while no one will pay much attention to the one who is prodigal with it. In American society, we weqpect a man with a bank account and Internal Revenue Office begins to investigate when a man begins to spend his money too freely.

We could go on commenting upon other features of the cultural pattern of the Spanish speaking community. As we have seen, some are positive others are not, some issue from Spanish culture others from the New World, and still others from the folk community. The situation is far from hopeless. Some collective responsibility has already been manifested by such organization with the Spanish speaking community as the Latin American Foundation whose orientation is definitely towards an acculturation through education.

The counseling service of the public schools, the recreation centers, the community centers, and the Welfare Council, and the Human Relations Commission are all forces at work in trying to bring about an enlightened integration of our human resources. The work of this workshop is another probe into the process which we all hope will be effective and useful.

4/1/58

MAÑANA IS TODAY *

by Arthur L. Campa**

During the height of the depression, a philanthropic organization sent the Navajo Indians a carload of pickles in order to alleviate the needs of that tribe. Unaccustomed as the Redmen were to such relishes, they were made no happier by the sincere efforts of their white brothers to appease their hunger. Pickles are a delectable embellishment to the menu of those who like pickles, but they add nothing to the happiness of those who do not eat them. Dried mutton or corn would have fulfilled the wants of the Navajo far better than the savory pickles. Equally disheartening were the results of the discarded system of Indian education which at one time forced a child to enter school for a given time, at the end of which he returned to the village and "took to the blanket." Many a head shook, disillusioned and disappointed, because the Redman insisted on finding happiness in his own way. Until recently, an Indian's own reaction to living, and his philosophy of life had not been greatly taken into account. Years ago the object was to make a white man, a poor imitation at that, rather than a better Indian, and the results were obviously very unsatisfactory.

"Happiness," someone has said, "is getting what you want." If it is pickles you want, beans will not satisfy you. But if the other fellow prefers beans and refuses our pickles, we call him a "bean eater." Moreover, some of us want our beans at a different time, adding the other element to the acquisition of happiness which is not only "getting what you want," but, "when you want it." In the satisfaction of material needs, the world differs very little. We all demand food and shelter, the means by which to live; but the ends for which to live, the spiritual phase of life, is not so uniformly satisfied. In formulating our criterion of spiritual guidance, we have before us three periods in life which determine the order of our existence: the past, the present, and the future. Our philosophy of living will revolve to a great extent around one of these three depending upon what time of life we consider most essential. The present is a reality, the past a recollection of a reality that has ceased to exist, and the future a conjecture of what may come to pass. Hence, the last two

---

*From *Fruit of the Vine*, Anthology of Western Writers. First published in 1938, *New Mexico Quarterly*

**Chairman, Department of Modern Foreign Languages, University of Denver.

form the basis of romanticism, since one is no longer here and the other has not yet arrived.

If we consider romanticism as a phase of life created by the imagination and opposed to realism, we can safely say that most people are romanticists. But the nature of that romanticism will depend upon what it is based. Both the Anglos and the Mexicans are romantic, except that Anglo-American romanticism is based on the future, and Spanish romanticism is nourished in the past. In this trinity of time, the present is greatly modified by the choice each makes of what has gone before or what is about to come. Anglo children, from an early age, are taught that the present is simply a preparation for the future, that the past is past and gone, and that one must look into the future for a vision. "Don't cry over spilt milk." "Hitch your wagon to a star." "Save for a rainy day." and "Be prepared." The present is projected into the future to such an extent that the child lives for the day when he shall grow up to be the president of a bank, a college professor, a policeman, or a successful engineer. In school the boy is tempted with stories of men who disregarded the present in order that they might achieve something great in the future. Yes, such a philosophy produces men of vision, of imagination; men who live constantly in the hope that some day "their ship may come in." Much may be said for this type of romanticism in the formative period of youth. Young men are willing to work their way through college, scrubbing floors, cleaning windows, and denying themselves untold happiness in the present, in order that the acquiring of a diploma in the end may bring about the longed-for fulfillment of their desires. When men have grandiose visions of the future, we often say that they are building "castles in Spain." Spanish castles to a Spaniard are merely recollection of what once was a reality. Castles built upon the future are practical American bungalows.

The interpretation given to present, past and future determines to some extent the philosophy that guides society. American society, while it may be temporarily dissatisfied, is always hopeful because of the insight and faith it has upon the future, and in the midst of the greatest depression it can say: "Prosperity is around the corner." Hispanic philosophy is, in many ways, quite the contrary. To a Mexicano the future is an unreality of which he is conscious only insofar as it can be projected into the present. The American may see it as a hypothesis upon which to speculate safely, sell on the installment plan, or buy insurance, but in New Mexico the future is attacked with a fatalism that is little short of a roulette wheel philosophy. *A ver que Dios nos da*. Come what may, there is consolation in the popular belief that *No hay mal que por bien no venga*. "It's all ill wind that blows nobody good."

The great emphasis is placed on the present simply because the present constitutes a reality. When the present has passed, it forms the basis of romanticism, a romanticism that is based upon that which once was a reality. To Hispanic peoples the past is interpreted in terms of achievement, lineage, and custom. Even their songs eulogize an old love, *Un amor que no se olvida ni se deja*, while in English, future old age is romanticized in "Silver threads among the gold." The former sings of a love that *was*, the latter of a love that *will* be. The Mexicano does not forget his traditions because they constitute his past reality, the basis for his romanticism. Tradition to the American, however, means an expedient, a convenient course for future action. The course of action in Spanish New Mexico is determined by conditions which exist in the present rather than by an accepted formula. Witness the New Mexican judge who ruled that cases be determined by their merit and not by precedent. A story told of a Mexican whose young wife ran away. The judge assured him that he would soon forget, and added, "Who knows, tomorrow another girl will come along." To which the injured husband answere dubiously, "Oh, yes, *manana*, but what do I do *now*?" He could not be consoled by illusions of tomorrow.

New Mexico, likewise, is the land of *today*, and if there is a future, the Mexicanos are willing to wait until it comes around and is transformed into a reality. Meanwhile, the future is conceived in an undetermined light, expressed in an indefinite term, *manana*. The translation of this word has led to a misinterpretation of purpose on the part of those who view the New Mexican with limited understanding of his philosophy. *Manana*, like the shrug of the shoulders, expresses a remoteness that the word "tomorrow" does not convey. It does not mean tomorrow. A hunter passed over a broken bridge several times near a New Mexican village in Mora county and every time he did so he was assured that the bridge would be fixed *manana*, but the bridge was never fixed on the morrow.

How disappointing is life in New Mexico to those who plan every minute of the future and know definitely that on Monday they will play bridge, on Tuesday attend a meeting, on Wednesday go to a dance, and bathe on Saturday. Julio Camba, the Spanish humorist, says: "We improvise everything, our fun aswell as our work." Anglo Americans, on the other hand, will warn a speaker a week in advance that he will be called upon at a banquet to make an "impromptu" speech!

The time for improvisation is the present, and those who live in the present, while leading a very improvised existence, will live more spontaneously and with more abandon. A call on a New Mexican friend may turn the evening into a social gathering. A dinner, a dance, a love affair, and even a fight may ensue, but none of it will be planned beforehand. The Anglo has calling hours, makes arrangement for his good times, and plans to meet a person whom he wishes to befriend. This attitude is a carryover from organized industry where schedules are meticulously observed for purposes of efficiency, and justly so, but it takes the "human" out of human relations at times.

New Mexico has been called the "Land of Manana" that is, the "Land of Today," when analyzed. "Never do today what you can do tomorrow" is an interpretation of *manana* that is misleading because it vitiates the realistic sense of actuality. The New Mexican never puts off until tomorrow what can be enjoyed *only* today. He prefers to live life from day to day with a minimum of concern over the morrow. The time to sit in the sun is when the sun is shining, for there is no assurance that the sun will shine when wanted. Many a picnic has been ruined for those who insist on setting the date in advance. The New Mexicans are likely to have a picnic when the weather is conducive to it. It is the course of action of realists who choose to enjoy the present rather than to speculate upon the future. The sunny side of the house is a convenient rendez-vous on sunny afternoons, but on cold days the same men who lounged lazily, vegetating against the wall, may be seen bringing in wood. To a Nordic this manner of doing is incomprehensible; it is improvident.

An educator was being shown through the rural districts in the mountainous sections of New Memico late in the Fall, and noticed that there were no stacks of wood for the Winter. He inquired from his travelling companion what sort of fuel these people used, and was informed that they used firewood. "But", he insisted, "where do they store it?" He was told that the wood from the neighboring woods was never stored. It seemed very strange to a man who projected himself onto the future that the New Mexican mountaineers should make no provisions in advance for the coming winter. The educator continued asking: "What do these people do when they need wood?" Whereupon he was promptly informed that the Mexicanos get their wood when they need it, and not before.

To most observers this attitude toward life means nothing more than indifference and laziness; to others it appears to be a series of contradictions. It is contradictory if we call it laziness and sheer indifference; not that there may not be, as in all men, those who are in reality indolent. But, laziness is an indisposition to exertion, and not a sequence of activity and inactivity. We characterize the Mexican peasant as a lazy indifferent fellow, yet the markets in Mexico are filled with millions of craft products meticulously made by hand, and with superb craftsmanship. The same peasant who sits in the sun and enjoys his leisure turns out millions of sarapes, crockery, etc., but he uses a different yardstick in employing his time and accounting for the future. A certain wantlessness restrains his acquisition of wealth, and living in the present consumes what the provident puts away for the future.

Yes, the Mexicanos in New Mexico continue living *today*. Thoughts of the morrow are far removed from their consciousness. Their Anglo brothers push on with their sights set on the future. Young boys turn to little men, young girls to little women. The former have bank account, the latter hope chests, but the Mexicano plays when he is a boy, works when necessary, pays for the bride's outfit when he marries her, and in his old age turns back and says: "Alla en mis tiempos." (Back in my day.) He has no desire to be young again, he is happy with the present, ages gracefully, and will derive great pleasure from recalling the past. It is his romanticism, a long sequence of past realities. Old women need not paint their faces to appear young, nor do old men need to turn into foxy grandpas. When they were young, they were allowed to do what young folks do, and their parents lost no sleep because their children had no thought of tomorrow.

In Spanish, even grammatically, the future is of little importance. In the last decade the future subjunctive has disappeared; the future tense is formed with the *present* of the auxiliary, and the present is used to express the future, "*La semana que entra vengo a verle*." (Next week I *come* to see you.) The most representative character of Spanish literature lived fast and furiously in the present, so much so that he was threatened with a future punishment to which Don Juan answered very characteristically: "*Tan largo* me lo fiais" (so late in coming), that is, he took little cognizance of the future.

One of the most profitless methods of selling to a Mexicano is the payment plan. One of two conditions will result. He refuses to buy, because he is afraid to tie himself to the future, or he will buy and be unable to make the payments when they fall due. Usually the company will recover the goods and the salesman will swear that the Mexicanos are all dishonest. The wise merchant will approach with his goods on pay day when the people have money, because they forget that there are thirty days to each month and spend in one day the wages that should carry them for the remaining twenty-nine days. The process is the reverse of widespread belief that the Mexicanos will work a whole month in order to spend it in one day. They will spend it when they get it. In Mexico, the *peones* in a sugar factory were getting fifty *centavos* a day. A very altruistic capitalist increased their wages to a *peso* a day. Three days later, no one showed up to work. When the workers were questioned, it was disclosed that fifty cents a day paid amply for their wants, therefore, when wages went up to a *peso*, it was necessary to work only three days a week.

In addition to the traditional realism and his impassiveness toward the future, there are other elements which characterize the Mexicano in New Mexico and make his philosophy of life incomprehensible to an outsider.

The new world *mestizo*, the result of a racial amalgamation, is a product that is not yet well defined. Like any biological hybrid, he is susceptible to irregularities and throwbacks. This fact adds greatly to the incomprehensibility of the Mexicano. The Indian has contributed a feeling of resignation and stolidity of character that has made possible the survival of life in New Mexico despite the great difficulties under which the population has had to live. It is remarkable to see the amount of suffering and want these people have been able to withstand. The lightheartedness of the Spaniard in the midst of an unkind fate is merely a complement to the basic endurance of the Indian. It is a philosophy determined mostly by the current flow of circumstances, a philosophy that is spontaneous, brilliant, and superficial, but durable. Spanish philosophy does not have the vertical dimension of Nordic philosophy, but it does possess a horizontal one which adds variety, lightheartedness, and gayety to life.

Place Europeans in the same conditions under which New Mexicans have had to live and they will become dissatisfied, refuse to remain and leave a ghost town in their wake. Anglos who come to New Mexico with a living income are disconcerted by the complacency with which life is led in the midst of poverty, and scantiness. This very resignation is conducive to a relatively peaceful state of affairs, a condition to be preferred these days to the constant shifting of population which the depression produced. The highways in New Mexico are not filled with thumb riders who seek to better themselves by moving. The Mexicano plods on, whether with a burro, small acreage, working for the highway, or employed by an Americano. There is no danger of these men starting a march to Washington.

New Mexico contains two general groups of people with a different understanding of life, both striving to live peacefully with each other. Both resort to comparisons in an effort to understand each other's ways. To judge comparatively two peoples that are not analogous is dangerous because it is misleading. The important question is not which is superior, or which is the standard, but rather, wherein are their differences a complement to each other.

As a further means of understanding acculturation in New Mexico, one must realize that American civilization is, for the most part, dependent upon industrialism, while New Mexican life is composed mostly of rural communities where the folk element is still a vital force. The rural element of English speaking United States has not found it so difficult to establish itself under more or less comparable conditions, but the urbanized segment in such a society finds little in common with the New Mexican peasant.

The more salient manifestations of folk culture appear in the form of craft and architecture. These are the things that the tourist and the newcomer consider concrete evidences of New Mexican culture, but what lies back of these products remains much of a mystery, even to those who are sympathetic. Moreover, there are other equally important phases of the Mexicano's life which need to be presented to a public who will, in time, either blend with him or outnumber him to extinction. The language of New Mexico, the song of the troubadour, the folk theatre, and other forms of folklore constitute a fundamental part of his existence. If each one of these elements is dealt with as a living force rather than as so much material to be catalogued according to some preconceived index, we shall have a picture of a state that is still vastly different from most of the others, though comparable, to some extent, with three or four which also have a bicultural background.

LANGUAGE BARRIERS IN INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS *

by Arthur L. Campa **

We have become accustomed to think of man as a member of a particular race, with a corresponding language, and with a culture that represents his biological and linguistic origin. There is no doubt that the nature of man is the sum total of these basic determinants, but the assumption that those factors are necessarily correlated leads to misleading conclusions in our cultural understanding. The relationship of race, language and culture seems obvious at a first glance, so we unwittingly accept their correlation. In fact, much of the "knowledge" which we have regarding other cultures is nothing more than traditional relationship which we have inherited as standards of knowledge. In the Southwest, for example, there is a marked tendency to designate as "Spanish" any culture trait, culture content, or characteristics observed in persons whose native tongue is Spanish. They refer to tortillas, chile, and tamales as "Spanish food," and, because this fare is characteristic of many Spanish speaking individuals, they also conclude that Spanish people are very fond of hot foods. Again, there are many Hispanicized people in the Southwest, whose racial origin is autochthonous, but whose language is Spanish. These people have certain physical characteristics such as dark hair, olive complexion, and dark eyes. As in the case of chile and tamales, many people conclude that all Spanish people are olive skinned and have dark eyes. The concept is carried further when they say, "The white people and the Spanish."

Correlations, such as the above, can be judged in a better light because they are current, but we also have some which we have taken for granted for so many centuries that we do not question them today. The British are said to be Anglo-Saxons because they speak a language whose basic pattern is Anglo-Saxon, that is, English. Yet, as race goes, the Islanders are Celts who were Anglo-Saxonized by the Anglos, Saxons, and Jutes. Likewise, the Celt-Iberians of what is now Spain were Latinized and today speak the language of Hispania, although racially they were littâe different, if at all, from the Celt-Iberian inhabitants of the British Isles before the Germanic invasions.

The modern Spaniard intuitively prefers to be known as a Galician, a Castillian or an Andalusian rather than a Spaniard,

*From Journal of Communication, November, 1951.

**Chairman, Department of Modern Foreign Languages, University of Denver.

even though all of them may speak the same language. They may be more aware that the culture-content of their region is not expressed by linguistic classification. Even more confusing is the generalized term of Latin in combination with race. The "Latin race" includes Italians, Spaniards, and Frenchmen, three different cultures whose relationship is that their respective language evolved from vulgar Latin some 2000 years ago. Actually, except for a few culture traits which develop uniformly in a common milieu, there is little similarity among these three peoples. There is a common assumption that these nationalities are similar in physical appearance. This similarity is comparable to that which exists among dogs of mixed ancestry, if you will pardon the comparison, but it does not establish a generality. The tendency to correlate language, culture, and race is carried to its greatest extreme when someone speaks of a "typical" Spaniard, Frenchman, etc. The American whose mind is set on standardization finds it difficult to accept the nonconformity of a short, dark complexioned Swede, a redheaded Spaniard or a fair haired Mexican. During the last war, many American soldiers were really amazed upon landing in Italy to find that the Italians were not all short, dark, and stocky. The insistence on using any of these determinants, but principally that of language, closes the door to the possibility of total understanding. If a person is blond he must be Anglo, if he is Anglo he can't be dark, if he is dark he is Spanish, (or French or Italian, because all these "Latin races" are dark!), if he speaks Spanish he eats Spanish food, he eats enchiladas, the latter must be Spanish food, and ad infinitum or ad absurdum.

Even in cases where the language and culture were the same at one time, they soon parted company when part of the group set up a separate political entity. Take the United States and England as an example. When Mr. Chamberlain returned home with a compromise with Hitler, he was hailed for his successful mission in England, while in America he was scorned for having compromised. Americans compromise, but unlike the English, they hardly consider it a victory. Again, take the word "clever." An Englishman speaking of a "clever girl" to another Englishman need not explain, but an American would not know what to expect of a girl so defined.

Spain and Spanish America also have grown far apart linguistically and culturally. Identical words do not have the same meaning at all in many cases. When a Spaniard says "Me choca" he means that he is taken by something different. A Mexican means that something is repulsive to him. The "Chulo" is an individual type in Madrid; in Mexico it means something beautiful, and in New Mexico it means a lap-dog. When a Spaniard says to someone "Vaya a pasearse," it is equivalent to the English "Go to hell." The New Mexican will tell you "Vaya a pasearse," meaning to drop in sometime.

Scholars realized long ago that the original linguistic correlations were being modified, but until recently there was little scientific evidence to prove it. Now we have in Spanish such studies as those of Dario Rubio, La Anarquia del Lenguaje, and the monumental work of Santamaria in his three volume Diccionario de Americanismos.

In the Southwest, where we have to deal with Anglos, Mexicans, and New Mexicans, we have a marked example of the cultural implications of language. The situation is far more complicated in this region because we must communicate our thinking in many cases by translating back and forth between two languages and in three cultures. A word in Spanish does not represent the same culture concept or trait that its linguistic equivalent does in English. Let us go back to the word "compromose." The uncompromising Spaniard in whose culture so strongly individualistic, ideas and concepts need not be alike, there is no need for compromise; hence the word compromise means a duty or an appointment. Many object to being called Mexican in English, but they use currently the term "Mexicano" in Spanish without any objection. Linguistically translated, "Mexicano" means Mexican, but culturally speaking the English rendition does not connote the same thing. The Spanish speaking individual in the Southwest does not achieve a real understanding of English by translation, but by a closer acquaintance with the culture that the language represents. And only in cases where the culture content of each language is understood can we have a bilingual individual. In passing, we indirectly seem to encourage a lack of real comprehension of language through our requirements for advanced degrees in which a candidate with the aid of a dictionary and some cramming is able to pass "successfully" a test in language.

Those who have studied the problem of education among Spanish speaking students tell us that there is a cultural lag which holds back these students. The pity of it is that in most schools the only thing that is open to such a student is translation of words which linguistically seem to have a close relationship, but which culturally represent totally different concepts. Take the case of Juan in a school somewhere in the Southwest. He has a certain amount of "amor propio" which is mistranslated as "pride," and then because it does not mean the same in English, Juan is said to have a "false pride." One day he gets into trouble with Pedro, one of his schoolmates and, there being no word "compromise" in their vocabulary nor in their culture-content, they resort to physical arguments. The teacher insists that Juan "apologize" to Pedro for what he did. "Go on" she insists, "apologize to him." Again Juan doesn't know what to say, because there is not word in Spanish for it, nor does the apologizing custom exist. The teacher is assuming that just as words are linguistically translated, so are cultural patterns. She continues, "Tell him you're sorry." This he refuses to do because he is a product of a realistic culture, loathe to change the realism of the past by the instrumentality of mere words. So he stays after school for being stubborn, disobedient and generally incorrigible. Juan still doesn't know the meaning of "apology", but if he is intellectually curious he may look up the word in Velasquez dictionary where he will find it mistranslated linguistically as "apologia." Not knowing this half dollar word he looks it up in the Academy dictionary where he finds to his amazement the following definition, "Discurso en alabanza de una persona" (an utterance in praise of a person.) Now he is mad at the teacher! The following day he can't find his pencil. When asked by the same teacher if he lost it, he promptly replies that he hasn't. Actually the pencil lost itself from Juan. "Se me perdio" (it lost itself on me.) That's it! After school, Juan is walking home and someone asks him if he missed the bus, but by now we know that he was not the active factor in this situation. The bus left him, "me dejo." He is a versatile boy, but don't make the mistake of saying he is "versatil:" this would mean he is superficial and changeable.

In addition to isolated words, there are also psychological attitudes characteristic of a given culture, which are difficult to understand and much more difficult to overcome in the process of acculturation. Punctuality is something that an American understands as mechanical precision. It is a by-product of an industrial and highly mechanized culture. The American dramatizes this event with whistles, lights, and gunfire. Even the clock "runs" while in Spanish it simply "walks" (el reloj anda.) My Mexican friends insist that a five o'clock appointment can be kept punctually until six. That is, it is five until it is six. To an American, the hour is a gear timing concept, and rightly so, because American industrial life is geared. This postulate is what wears so much rubber at intersections, and causes people to spend even days in line in order to be the first person to enter when the gates open. We have been pushing this to such an extent that our time perspective projects up beyond the present and into future, and we publish the Saturday Evening Post on Thursday and the magazines come out one month in advance. This to a Spanish speaking person is still incomprehensible. He still is sticking to the present and says "manana" to the rest. Manana does not arise because of any consideration of the morrow, that would be an American culture trait, but rather because the morrow is not at all considered. Manana stems from the Spanish concept of reality which gives preeminence to the present, that is, to reality. He calls the present "actualidad," that which really exists.

No one will deny that the sum total of behavior patterns, values and attitudes which make up any culture is reflected in the language of the culture providing that the culture content can be properly determined. It should be also realized that each language attempts to correlate its culture with little or no reference to similar correlations in other languages. When the language is forced to conform abitrarily to the patterns of another culture we have the sort of thing that has grown up in the Hispanized English and Anglicized Spanish spoken in New Mexico. If both culture-content and vocabulary are lacking, the practice is to adopt both in order to preserve the newly acquired concept in its own mold.

This process adds such words as esprit de corps, savoir faire, petite, al fresco, sombrero, patio, corral, etc.

This problem of race, culture, and language correlation was accentualted when representatives of the United Nations attempted to iron out their differences at the council table. An interesting report of what happened at the meeting of the United Nations in Paris in 1949 is given by Ina Telberg in the September '49 issue of The United Nations magazine, in an article entitled "They don't do it our way.".

She reports that the Russians are disliked because of the length of their speeches and for their irony and sarcasm, a traditional custom of the Russians in their political speech-making which has nothing to do with Russia's present government. The Latins, on the other hand, do not employ sarcasm but do sprinkle liberal doses of poetic imagery and literary allusions. The Cuban delegate to the Social Committee of the Assembly in Paris, tired of the Chairman's constant interruptions, protested, "Not being all Nordics and Anglo-Saxons, we cannot fit into the pattern of brevity, terseness and conciseness which you demand of us, Mr. Chairman. Such patterns befit the Northerners, but we like an orator to be imaginative, emotional, moving..." Another Latin American delegate pleaded that the expression "From the cradle to the grave" be inserted in the Article of the Declaration of Human Rights. A Western European delegate pronounced, "Such phrases have no place in a serious document." "But the Declaration should be beautifully worded," argued another Latin representative. "It's a legal document, not a poem," muttered a pragmatic delegate. The United States delegate whispered an aside, "Why not 'From the womb to the tomb'-- it rhymes at least!"

There were also numerous cross-cultural misunderstandings when American delegates attempted to find a common ground by means of jokes which insulted the Russians and left others cold. Then too, there was the concept of time or what the psychologists call time perspective. Noon meant meal-time to the American Chairman, but it meant nothing of the sort to the Orientals who insisted on keeping the meetings open all day. A western European speaking on the Declaration of Human Rights said, "Man is of divine origin, endowed by nature with reason and conscience." To which a Buddhist interposed, "All life is of divine origin, not only human life." Sometimes the situations were farcial. A Chinese delegate was listening to a discussion in English when a Russian said, "Gentlemen, let us not behave like a bull in a china shop." The Chinese delegate promptly raised his hand and said, "Mr. Chairman, I should like the Soviet delegate to explain just what China has to do with his objections."

Our system for the teaching of languages in America is based on the false assumption that language is a mechanical process which, given a set of rules and translation, can be acquired and successfully learned by anyone. That in itself is not so bad were it not for the fact that many seem to believe that the process ends there. It might be helpful for us to emphasize the culture content of language rather than the mechanics of transliteration. Language as a means of effective communication would then transmit much more meaning of each other's culture.

SPANISH, MEXICAN, NATIVE *
The Problem of Nomenclature

by Dr. Arthur L. Campa**

One of the difficult problems that confronts anyone making a study of New Mexico is the selection of an appropriate term to designate the Spanish-speaking inhabitants. Such names as "native," "Spanish-American," "Spanish," and "Mexican" are applied to them, but none of these is restrictive or accurate enough. Those who come from that part of the United States where the human family is divided into two colors, often refer to New Mexican as "non-white" by implication. They speak of "white people and natives."

On the whole, the terminology is very misleading because it is based on prejudice and confused notions of race and nationality. As a result, any name applied to the New Mexicans, if we may call them that for the time being, expresses an attitude of mind rather than a clear concept of race or culture.

Race consciousness is relatively new in New Mexico. Prior to the American occupation it did not exist because the Mexicans, like the Spaniards were not concerned with distinctions of race or color. A man was a Spaniard in colonial days when born in Spain; if born of Spanish parents in the New World he was a creole; if born of mixed ancestry a mestizo, and simply an Indian if he was unmixed with European. After the wars of Independence in Spanish America, the creoles became nationals of whatever country they were living in. By virtue of this political change everyone in New Mexico became a Mexican after 1821 and remained so until 1846 when the United States government took over the Southwest.

Those who still think in terms of the past century insist that the Mexican. The New Mexican resents this, not on the basis of nationality but on the assumption that he belongs to a different race. He too makes the mistake of thinking that Mexican is a racial term. Since he is actually no different in appearance from the inhabitants below the Rio Grande, Americans classify him in the same category despite his American citizenship. In those places in the West where the Alamo episode is still remembered, New Mexicans find their citizenship of little avail.

The New Mexican's first reaction, as a result of this "American" attitude, is to disassociate himself from anything that carries a

---

* From: Spanish Folk-Poetry in New Mexcio.

** Chairman, Department of Modern Foreign Languages, University of Denver.

Mexican implication. To do this he must insist on his difference in origin. He is a "direct descendant of the Spanish conquerors," bearing in mind that anyone who came into New Mexico before 1848 may be considered a "conqueror." As a child of the conquerors he can logically claim to be of "pure Spanish blood." When this line of thinking is carried to its logical conclusion, the deductions are that the New Mexicans are not "Mexican," for the latter have no Spanish blood, and that there is no aboriginal admixture in the former. Being American citizens, the next step is to combine the concept of race with that of nationality and the hyphenated Spanish-American is the result. Such a name serves a triple purpose; it lifts from the New Mexican the opprobrium of being a Mexican; it makes him a member of the "white" race, and expresses his American citizenship.

The difficulty with "Spanish-American" is that, while it suits the New Mexican in the abstract, there is little in his appearance and origin that upholds the distinction he is trying so hard to make.

In the first place, the color-conscious Anglos, noting the preponderance of aboriginal blood in many of those who call themselves "Spanish" or "Spanish-American," hesitate to refer to them as such because Spanish connotes European to them. Again, the majority of Mexican laborers who come to work in the United States are mestizos and Indians who do not differ greatly from those individuals whom the Anglos do not classify as Spanish. Because of the association of Mexican with the darker skinned laborer from the south, this purely national term is applied to the darker shades, and that of Spanish to the light complexioned. From a cultural view-point, the differences between the New Mexican and the Mexican are regional distinctions that occur within a similar culture.

The substitution of the name "Spanish" for everything in New Mexico does not change the substance of traits that are undisputedly Mexican. The "Spanish" suppers given by clubs and church societies are in reality Mexican dishes to which no truly Spanish palate is accustomed. The "Spanish" songs sung by school children and by radio performers in New Mexico are as Mexican as tortillas de maiz, chicharrones de puerco, chile con carne, and the sopaipillas at Christmas time. The real cultural differences between the region north of the Rio Grande and that below are those which the New Mexican has acquired by close contact with American life. In asense, it is his dehispanization, his falling away from Spanish, that stamps him as a different individual. The Mexican is different in that he preserves his Spanish language, literature, and menu. The New Mexican is educated in English and naturally acquires traits and habits that are American.

A number of well-meaning people who wish to avoid the vexing problem of race and nationality refer to the New Mexicans as "natives." Unfortunately, there are those who employ the same term in a derrogatory sense, and with a feeling of superiority. Naturally, anyone born on New Mexican soil has a legal claim to the distinction of native, and of late such considerations have entered the "native son" movement. In any case, the name is too general to identify a group of people who differ so greatly from the usual American that they themselves never say "*nosotros los americanos*," although they may express a political concept in English: "We Americans."

The choice of a suitable term depends upon the two groups concerned: those who apply the name, and those to whom it is applied. Both have divergent ideas regarding race and nationality and in most cases such notions are ill-advised. The Anglo, who may be any Nordic or English-speaking American, be he German, Swedist, Irish, or Jewish, prefers to call the New Mexican "Mexican" or "native," while the latter prefers to be known as "Spanish" or "Spanish-American." Obviously they are not Mexicans, and they have not been since 1848; neither are they natives exclusively. Few can prove conclusively to be of Spanish descent, and none of them are Spanish-American, considering that such an adjective applies to people in Spanish-America. On the other hand, there are valid reasons why New Mexicans may claim in part any or all of the foregoing appelations. Legally and nationally they are any or all of Americans; linguistically, Spanish; Spanish-American, geographically; culturally, Mexican; native by birth, and New Mexican by state boundaries. What are they racially, since that seems to be of so great concern? The answer to that question may be found in the history of the conquest.

The trouble with all the terminology developed in New Mexico is that it is based on a logic that excludes the human factor. The whole thing is characterized by anomalies which attempt to justify prejudices and defense mechanisms. If we look at the problem disinterestedly we will be forced to reject race and nationality as a criterion by which to arrive at a happy solution. Logic cannot be used exclusively because the folk, and most of the New Mexican population consists of it, is illogical. It is to the general folk that we should go in order to find a proper term. It is not a matter of what people are called by others, nor what they would like to be called, but what they call themselves when speaking in an unbuttoned frankness. They are all Americans; they know it, yet they never speak in Spanish of themselves as *nosotros los americanos* any more than they say *nosotros los espanoles*.

The folk in their naive simplicity have cast aside all preoccupations of race, in fact, they are above racial distinctions, and, in the tradition of their forebears, are not much concerned with skin tones. They conceive of their own kin in realistic terms such as *nosotros*, *nuestra gente*, *la raza*, and *nosotros los mexicanos*. By *mexicanos* they do not mean Mexicans; neither can it be translated as such. In fact the term must remain in the language in which it was conceived. *Mexicanos*, the culture that still nurtures them when out of school. Mexican art, dress, music, and food are still the rule among these *mexicanos* north of the river. *Mexicano de Mexico* is the phrase that distinguishes the Mexican national. By inference it admits of a mexicano on either side of the river.

Thus the entire gamut of names is run in an effort to find a suitable term for the New Mexican who became indefinable when his thinking was plagued with defense mechanisms and inaccurate notions of race. Meanwhile he retains his own nomenclature. Mexicano in Spanish expresses to him a concept of culture that no other term, not even a translation of that same term, can convey.

CULTURAL FACTORS IN PUBLIC HEALTH[1]

by Lyle Saunders*

A few years ago, the Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama, an agency associated with the World Health Organization, undertook a project in the little Guatemalan village of Magdalena Altos Milpas to determine what food elements were needed to supplement the local diet. The program involved giving supplemental foods to school children and then making periodic tests to ascertain the results. An important part of the testing program was the drawing of blood samples at fairly frequent intervals. The program began well enough, but within a short time it became apparent that opposition was developing among the Indian villagers. Children began to miss school; some refused the food supplements; others reported that their parents had forbidden them to participate in any part of the project. Adults began to complain to project members about the repeated attempts to take blood from their children and matters rapidly moved toward the point where the continuance of the project was endangered. At this point, Dr. Richard Adams, a cultural anthropologist on the staff of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, the western hemisphere representative of the World Health Organization, was called in for consulation. His inquiries turned up the main source of difficulty in a widespread belief among the villagers that blood is non-regenerative and that once lost is is gone for good leaving the individual permanently weakened. A single blood sample was not thought to be very important since relatively little blood is lost, but the villagers had become alarmed at the repeated blood taking, fearing that it would permanently endanger the health of their children. As the difficulty lay in a belief of the villagers about blood, so did the solution that Dr. Adams was able to work out.[1] As in many other Indian communities blood was thought by the Magdalenos to be a good indicator of weakness or strength in an individual, and weakness or strength were known to be qualities that predisposed a person to be sick or well. Why should not blood then be regarded as an indicator of the present or potential status of an individual's health? Staff members began to discuss this proposition in the community, pointing out the necessity of taking blood samples to determine if the blood were sick or well in order to know whether the individual was or was not in need of curing services. The logic of the argument was accepted, and the testing program, which had been halted for a time, started again and was carried through with more than adequate cooperation from the parent group.

[1] Prepared for Annual Meeting of Public Health Nurses of Wyoming, Cheyenne, October 20, 1955

* Associate Professor of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, University of Colorado, School of Medicine

A study recently undertaken in a large metropolitan hospital turned up some striking differences in the ways various kinds of people respond to spontaneous pain.[2] Members of one group, designated Old Americans, tended to endure pain with stoical and "manly" self discipline, revealing their feelings only when alone or in the presence of close relatives or old friends. Members of two other groups, all adult males like the Old Americans, tended to be much more expressive and to vent their feelings in moaning, crying, complaining whenever they were in pain. Of these latter two, one group--the Italians--tended to be satisfied whenever anything was done to relieve their pain. Members of the other group--Jews--although they reacted to pain in much the same way as the Italians, were not satisfied with the simple relief of their symptoms and were, in fact, inclined to resist any attempts at relief unless they were convinced that the effort was also directed at the cause of the pain. They physicians, nurses, and others treating these patients were found to have, as might be expected, feelings about these various reaction patterns, particularly when the behavior exhibited differed to any extent from the way they though patients ought to behave.

One day last year, so I am told, lightning struck a tree close to an Indian Service sanitarium in Arizona. Soon thereafter patients (all Navajos) began to leave against medical advice. A place where lightning has struct is to Navajos a dangerous place, and the feeling of threat was great enough to out-weigh the possible danger to their health and that of those they came into contact with that would result from their leaving the sanitarium. The exodus was stopped only when a Navajo "singer", flown from Window Rock in a chartered plane to help handle what was rapidly becoming a medical emergency, conducted a "sing" over the public address system of the sanitarium. This ritual action counteracted the evil influences released by the lightning stroke and by rendering the institution psychically sterile made it again a safe place for Navajo patients to be.

And in Denver, not too long ago, the environmental sanitation division of the health department found itself in a squabble with certain poultry processing establishments in which the point at issue was a set of procedures necessary to make poultry kosher. The procedures that, from a religious point of view, were absolutely essential to make the poultry fit for human consumption were, from a public health point of view, exactly those that were making it unfit for people to eat. You can imagine the difficulty in arriving at a mutually satisfactory compromise in a situation such as this where two strongly held values come into direct conflict.

What these incidents have in common is that they all involve situations in which cultural factors clearly and directly influenced activities and programs in the field of health. A cultural belief of the Guatemalan Indians threatened to block scientific research program, and another cultural belief made it possible for the program to continue. Cultural components were found to be associated with characteristic patterns of response to pain, and physicians were able to gain a new and deeper understanding of the behavior of their patients and themselves. Indians interpreted a phenomenon of nature in the light of cultural beliefs and concluded that a sanitarium was a dangerous, rather than a safe, place to be. And environmental sanitation experts in a modern city found themselves at odds with a point of view and a set of procedures that have shaped the actions of men for more than two thousand years.

The influence of cultural factors on medical and public health programs is, of course, nothing new. It has been going on as long as there have been activities deliberately oriented towards health and disease. What is somewhat more recent, if not exactly new, is a recognition and attempted understanding of the phenomenon of culture and the beginning of efforts to control it and its effects much as we do other variables in the problems with which we deal.

With a less sophisticated audience than this, I should feel compelled to stop and explain in detail what culture is. With you it will not be necessary--which is just as well because I suspect that the concept is really undefinable. I like, just as a point of reference, a definition by Paul Walter that "culture is learned ways of acting and thinking which are transmitted by group members to other group members and which provide for every individual ready-made and tested solutions for vital life problems."[3] I like too, because it reveals the scope of the concept, Margaret Mead's statement that culture "covers not only the arts and sciences, religions and philosophies, but also the systems of technology, the political practices, the small intimate habits of daily life, such as the way of preparing or eating food, or of hushing a child to sleep, as well as the method of electing a prime minister of changing the constitution."[4] Or, she might have added, of naming an illness, or preparing a baby's formula, or inventing a vaccine, or organizing a program to improve the public health. Culture is like a man-made environment that intervenes in countless ways between the individual and his physical environment--and between each individual and his human environment as well. The physical environment provides edible substances; culture determines whether or not they shall be used as food. Nature supplies combustible materials; culture determines which of them shall be used as fuel. Nature is generous with hazards and discomforts--cold and parasites and dangerous animals and substances; culture provides ways of guarding against them or minimizing their influences. Nature peoples our world with other human beings; culture enables us to identify them as merchant, tailor, beggarman, thief, doctor, lawyer, or Indian chief. Nature provides phenomena of all sorts--plants and animals, people and events, pots and pans and sealing wax, cabbages and kings-- and culture gives us all of them such meanings as they have for us. Culture, then, is a vast complex made up, not of things, but of ideas about things; of attitudes or orientations toward things; of actions directed towards things, both tangible and intangible.

One important part of culture is medicine--that body of beliefs and practices, customs and laws, folkways and conventions oriented toward the promotion and maintenance of "health" (however it may be defined) and the alleviation, cure or prevention of whatever is regarded as "disease". And "medicine", it must be remembered, is a part of *any* culture. It is not just what we know and do, but what members of any cultural group know and do with respect to their notions of health and disease. Thus, there is not just one medicine, but many medical complexes, each of which is an integral and meaningful part of some culture. The medicine of another group may seem to us nothing more than a random collection of ignorant and superstitious practices; ours may appear the same way to them. We, for example, have recently come to make considerable use of a yeast mold preparation in some of our therapeutic routines. Navajos have for centuries used corn and squash pollen in some of theirs. The idea that pollen could have any therapeutic value--particularly as it is used--seems as ridiculous to many of us as the notion of yeast mold as a remedy must seem to many Navajo. Yet both give results. Ours is probably a better remedy in that it will work on anybody--anybody who has the kind of illness it works on, that is--whereas pollen only gives results for Navajos. And here we encounter an intriguing and disturbing idea--and one whose implications for medicine and public health would take a couple of lifetimes to explore: some therapeutic routines are effective only when the affected individual (and usually the practitioner as well) is a member of a particular cultural group. The pollens of certain plants, when properly used by qualified practitioners, are reasonably effective therapeutic agents for some conditions defined as disease in the Navajo culture. These same pollens used in the same way have no known therapeutic value in the treatment of similar conditions among Anglos. Why the difference? The most plausible explanation, I think, will be in terms of the concept of culture and its relation to the behavior patterns of people. Rather clear cut evidence that cultural meanings and actions can produce observable clinical changes in both the structure and function of various organ systems is contained in the recent book by Leo Simmons and Harold Wolff, *Social Science in Medicine*,[5] in the form of a communication reporting the observations of Drs. Wolf, Bird, and Smith of a New Guinea patient who was the victim of a ritualistic act by a person of known competence and power, designed to bring about his death. When he learned of the action against him he took to his bed, and a few days later, in spite of all the efforts of the three doctors, he died. Autopsy findings were inconclusive, but the report contained two revealing statements. "No immediate cause of death was discovered. The likelihood is that the death was due to rejection of fluids brought about by psychological reactions to tribal rejection."

But we do not have to go to New Guinea or even the Navajo reservation to observe the effects of culture on the human body. Consider the statistically significant findings of Franz Boaz of the increase in height as compared with their parents of children of immigrants, or the relationship that may exist between smoking and lung cancer, or the differential distribution of tuberculosis or venereal disease in our population, and the fact of a relationship between culture and somatic conditions, if not always the mechanism of the relationship, is immediately apparent.

A few phrases back I spoke of "conditions defined as diseases in the Navajo culture". This sounded as if what I intended to convey was the implication that disease is somehow a matter of cultural definition. And, in fact, this is an idea that I should like to present. At first glance the notion that disease may be thought of as a cultural as well as a biological phenomenon seems to do some violence to our conventional conceptions of illness and disease. Most of us are accustomed to thinking about disease in biological terms. We are less accustomed to considering it from a social or cultural frame of reference. Smallpox is certainly a disease, regardless of the social memberships of the persons who have it. Cancer seems to progress in the same inexorable fashion whether the affected person is a Hottentot or an arch-bishop. These statements seem beyond argument--and probably are, so long as we agree to define disease solely from a biological frame of reference. All human beings, as you very well know, belong to the same biological species and all, unless they have an acquired immunity of some sort, react in about the same way to various kinds of stress originating in the physical environment as do others of their age, sex, and general physical condition. The person who has been invaded by a sufficient number of microorganisms of a certain type undergoes a series of biological adaptations that manifest themselves in both overt and covert symptoms. This reaction is relatively independent of culture. If this is all that we mean by the term disease, then disease is not in any meaningful sense a cultural phenomenon.

But actually, among all people there is much more to it than this. The reactive symptoms are invested with meanings that the reacting person and others in his society have learned from their culture. The reacting individual becomes a special kind of person; he acquires a somewhat different social position that enables him to make different claims on other persons and to expect that their behavior toward him will change to that suitable to his new status. (In our culture, he becomes a "patient".) But it must be remembered that it is not solely to his symptoms that the actions of the "sick" person and his fellows are oriented. It is rather to the meanings that the symptoms have for them--and these meanings are a part of culture. This would be a pointless observation if among all cultures--or among all sub-culture groups within a given culture--the same meanings were always given the same symptoms. But as a matter of observable fact they are not. There is probably no set of symptoms, no objective biological conditions that are everywhere and at all times assigned to the same meaning. This is to say that there are probably no sets of symptoms, no biological conditions that are everywhere and always defined as disease. For example, infestation by intestinal worms is regarded by most of us as a kind of disease. Among the people on the Island of Yap, it has been reported that worms are considered a necessary part of the digestive process. On Yap, nobody gets excited if he or his children have worms; he only gets disturbed if they don't. Pinta, a type of dertmatosis endemic in certain parts of tropical America, is regarded by most groups whose members experience it as a mild disease. It is so common among one tribe of Amazon River Indians that those who have it are considered normal, those who don't as diseased. Tuberculosis, in its early stages, is recognized as a serious disease in our culture. Among some elements of our Spanish-speaking population in the Southwest, however, its symptoms are likely to be completely disregarded until the disease has progressed to the point where they can no longer be ignored. Susto, empacho, colorina are the names of diseases common in Latin American countries that have no counterpart here, except among some sections of the Spanish-speaking population of the Southwest.

Not only do definition of what constitutes disease vary from one culture to another, but they also may change within a given culture from time to time. Such a shift can be seen in our own culture in recent yrars with the increasing concern for symptoms we have come to know as mental disease. Pregnancy, which was long regarded as a normal process of no particular medical significance, and by many people still is, has come to be defined as a kind of self limiting illness requiring examination, careful observation throughout much of the pregnancy period, and the attendance of a physician before, during, and after delivery. Enuresis, not long ago regarded as a more or less normal characteristic of children during certain stages of their development, is increasingly being invested with significance as a symptom of an underlying personality disorder. Alcholism has come to be regarded as a malady, the victims of which should more properly receive treatment than censure.

Health, which is most commonly defined in residual terms as the absence of disease or other disabling conditions, is associated with conceptions of normal functioning. But what is or is not regarded as "normal" is also relative to culture, so that conditions, states, or types of functioning that are regarded as normal by one cultural group may be seen as abnormal or pathological by another. Hallucinations in one society may lead to an individual's being treated as a diseased person; in another they may lead to increased status and the role of seer or prophet. Chronic malnutrition may be seen by one people as pathological; by another as simply the normal state of man about which no one need to be excited. Dr. Earl Koos, in his report on "Regionville", quotes the reaction of a low income housewife to a query about backache: "I'd look silly, wouldn't I, going to see a doctor for a backache. My mother always had a backache, as long as I can remember, and didn't do anything about it. It didn't kill her either...If I went to a doctor for that my friends would hoot me out of town. That's just something you have I guess. Why let it get you down?"[6]

The point to which all the foregoing can be regarded as a prelude is that the way people regard health and disease and the behaviors that they consider as appropriate to the maintenance of the one and the avoidance or alleviation of the other are in part, at least, a function of their membership in cultural groups. And this is a point that, I believe, has some relevance for the work of health departments and the various programs they operate. From one point of view, most public health programs have as their principal objective to bring about some desired change in the patterns of action or the body of belief and knowledge or the sets of tastes and preference of groups of people. People in health departments want other people to drink safe water, to dispose of waste products in such a way that they will not contaminate anything, to immunize themselves and their children against various preventable disease conditions, to eat wholesome and nutritious foods, to have periodical health examinations, to behave in such a way as to prevent the spread of infectious or contagious diseases, to choose and use wisely medical personnel and facilities. For some kinds of programs--for example, water supply, garbage and sewage disposal, laboratory services--the participation of the public and the change required in customary knowledge and behavior is minimal. About all that is expected or needed is that the public, through their governmental agencies and their support of tax programs, will provide the necessary resources and technological personnel to assure that the job can be done. For other kinds of programs--e.g. those dealing with the control of communicable disease, maternal and child health, oral health, the providing of services to handicapped children, bedside nursing and home care programs--the participation of people in the general population is crucial to the success or failure of the program and considerable change in customary ways of acting or thinking may be required. Mothers may be expected to bring healthy babies in for regular examination; to receive and accept instruction in child rearing practices from childless women far younger than themselves; to engage in what may seem to them to be troublesome and time consuming activities; to change their domestic economy; to prepare and serve unfamiliar foods; to modify long established ways of thinking about health and disease and the relationship of many familiar activities to both. Home relationships may be disturbed when the grandmother is no longer considered an oracle on health matters, or when it becomes necessary to explain to the husband why his familiar foods are no longer on the table, or why he should pay for dental work for the children. Neighborhood relations may become strained when one family learns more or changes faster than another.

Many of the changes by the acceptance of present day health practices are relatively minor and could probably be brought about rather easily were it not for one aspect of the nature of culture. Culture is a complex whole, the several parts of which are dynamically inter-related. What happens in one part invariably influences all the rest. It is probably no more possible to bring a little change in a cultural system than it is to become just a little bit pregnant. As Robert Merton long ago pointed out in his "Essay on Latent and Manifest Functions", every action has its intended purpose and also its unintended and often unrealized results. Consider, for example, what the invention of the gasoline engine did to the buggy whip manufacturers. Or the effect the development of the self-starter had on the emancipation of women. Or the changes which industrial living has brought about in family life. Or how the introduction of antibiotics has affected the status of the ear, nose, and throat specialist. Or, going back to our illustration of a few sentences ago, how mamma's prenatal reliance on a nurse and a doctor has neatly undercut one of the few remaining functions of grandma.

The changes that public health people seek to bring about in the lives of the people they serve can fairly be described as cultural changes. Public health activity from this point of view is an effort at directed cultural change. And if this is a reasonable statement, it would also seem reasonable that people in public health might want to know something about the phenomenon of culture as one of the variables they must deal with in their work. Such a knowledge would seem to be desirable for two reasons: 1) to contribute to economy of effort and assure more certain success in bringing about desired changes; and 2) to minimize the possibility of unanticipated, undesired, and undesirable consequences. In connection with this second point, one by-product of a knowledge of culture may well be a heightened ability to distinguish between that which is truly sound in public health practice and that which represents only the folklore, fashion, and custom that exists in our ways of doing things. John Hanlon, for example, in his recent book on Principles of Public Health Administration, reports the bewilderment of a native of Thailand who was the recipient of suggestions from American sanitarians: "You Americans are funny. Before you came here, if I felt like relieving myself, I found a quiet spot in the open with gentle breezes and often a pleasant vista. Then you came along and convinced me that this material that comes from me is one of the most dangerous things with which people can have contact. In other words, I should stay away from it as far as possible. Then the next thing you told me was that I should dig a hole, and not only I, but many other people should concentrate this dangerous material in that hole. So now I have even closer contact, not only with my own but everyone else's, and in a dark, smelly place with no view at all."[7] And, in a similar vein, George Foster in an unpublished manuscript for the Social Science Research speaks of a letter from an Iranian friend telling how in Iran, American public health experts insisted, in the face of visible evidence to the contrary, that defecation in the open air would produce flies. "Advanced" western public health methods produced latrines, as an advance over the old practices, which, when used, became fly breeding spots, so that villages formerly essentially free of flies became infested.

The effectiveness of public health efforts to bring about culture change could be improved, I believe, through the deliberate and self conscious use of a cultural frame of reference in approaching this aspect of the total problem. For such an approach would help to insure that before an attempt was made to introduce new behavior patterns, some effort would be made to understand the old patterns, the way they come about, the functions they serve, the way they inter-related with one another, and how they must easily and certainly could be changed. It might have saved a good deal of cost and effort a year or so ago had anyone in the Peruvian Ministry of Health taken the trouble to consider what cultural factors might lie behind the apparent indifference of Peruvian village housewives to the common-sense suggestion that they boil the water they and their families drink.[8] And those who work with Navajos might do well to spend some time on the apparently irrevelant task of understanding the meaning of a Navajo "sing" (as many of them have) as a means of improving the effectiveness of their work. A cultural frame of reference can "make sense" of the frequently observed reluctance of Spanish-Americans in the Southwest to send their relatives to hospitals for surgery or for long term tuberculosis treatment, or why orthodox Jews resist surgery on Monday, and such a frame of reference might even contribute to an understanding of the flourishing business many sub-marginal professionals and makers and vendors of worthless nostrums enjoy in our culture.

I have spoken perhaps as if culture and culture difference were concepts applying only to relations between widely dissimilar peoples. Actually their influence is much more common and close at hand than I have made it sound. One does not have to go to Iran or Thailand or Guatemala to find examples; they are readily available in Cheyenne, or Laramie, or Denver, or Casper--or anywhere else where health programs operate.

There are at least four kinds of cultural (or sub-cultural) differences that may influence the relationships between public health personnel and the populations whom their efforts are intended to benefit. These may exist separately or in any combination. The fact that they exist at all and that they can have profound effect on the course of a public health program makes it imperative that persons active in such programs know who (in terms of culture) they are working with and what kinds of cultural influence may be operating.

Probably the most common of these differences is that between people with a certain kind of professional competence and the general public who are untrained in that specialty. Any profession may be thought of as a sub-cultural system. Members of a profession, although they may and do belong to the larger culture and share many culture traits with layment, also have many cultural elements that are peculiar to their own group. They have their own special area of knowledge; their own specialized language; their own technology; their own system of regulative norms for assuring that individual members conform to the behavior standards of the group; their own set of values; and their own ideologies for explaining, justifying and rationalizing what they do. Relatively little of this specialized culture is shared by non-members. In fact, a large part of the experience of becoming a member of a profession consists in learning the special culture of the group. One who enters training for a profession masters a particular subject matter, a body of knowledge relating to the work that is done by the professional group; he learns a vocabulary that will permit him to communicate effectively and precisely with his colleagues; he learns how to perform the functions for which the profession exists; he learns a set of ethical prescriptions which tell him what he may do, what he must do, and what he must not do as a member of his profession. He undergoes, in short, a process not unlike that by which children are rapidly and effectively "socialized" in the groups into which they are born. As a result of this acculturative process he acquires a high degree of technical competence and an ability to communicate and work easily and effectively with others in his profession or related professional fields. On the other hand he may develop what Veblen has called a "trained incapacity" for communication and interaction with laymen, since he brings to any situation involving interaction with them knowledge, values, and expectations that they, lacking his training, cannot possibly share. Training in a profession is a little like the effect of looking through a microscope. It vastly sharpens one's perception of a restricted field, permitting a point of view and a breadth of understanding that one who looks with the naked eye cannot share. The professional person sees, as it were, the teeming activity in his field of interest; the layman sees only a drop of water on the slide. And the difference in the frame of reference does make for difficulties of communication. Such communication difficulties, of course, are surmountable--but they do require that the professional person who works with laymen be aware of the sub-cultural difference that exists between him and his clients or patients and that he take pains to be certain that what he does or says makes sense not only from his specialized point of view, but also in terms of the frame of reference from which the layman is viewing the situation.

A second type of cultural difference that may have implications for the work of people in public health is that between rural and urban dwellers. The nature of this difference was dramatized long ago in the familiar fable of the town mouse and the country mouse, neither of whom could see anything good in the way of life of the other. It is, of course, true that modern means of transportation and communication have reduced the spread between the life styles of city and country people. Nevertheless, some differences do remain and are of such nature as to require certain modifications of public health programs and procedures. A recognition of the special health problems and needs of rural peoole is to be found in the recently organized Iowa Project in Agricultural Medicine which will bring together a team of specialists including a veterinarian and a sociologist in addition to usual categories of public health personnel to devise and apply methods of fitting public health practices to the peculiar needs of rural communities. The inclusion of a sociologist on the project team calls attention to something that is frequently overlooked in rural health programs: the fact that not only is the environmental situation so different from the urban one as to require modifications in program form and content, but that rural people are also culturally different from urban people in many ways that need to be taken into account when health programs are planned for them.

A third type of cultural differences that affects the work of public health people is that deriving from social class membership. Although it is a basic and cherished tenet of the American creed that "all men are born free and equal" the reality situation is such that if we are to be honest with ourselves and each other we must admit with George Orwell that "some are more equal than others". Social classes do exist in this country despite many statements to the contrary and they have much to do with the characteristic ways people respond to one another.

Social class is recognized by sociologists and anthropologists as a part of a wider phenomenon of stratification--the separation and recognition of rank orders of persons with differential access to various kinds of privilege and responsibility. Stratification, even though it implies inequality of privilege, is not something undesirable that we should be concerned to get rid of. In some form it exists everywhere and among all people--and it is, in fact, a necessary condition for the maintenance of enough order to enable people to get along with one another and to survive. For example, a stratification system everywhere defines the relationships between adult and child in such a way that children get fed, cared for, protected during that period of their development when they are unable to care for themselves. The basis of ranking in a stratification system may be almost anything: age, sex, knowledge, manners, ability, wealth, occupation--or any combination of these. One kind of ranking is that which, in a society such as ours, divides people into large aggregations on the basis of some homogeneity of sub-cultural characteristics--social class.

There is probably no social phenomonon that has been more extensively studied than social class. The literature is too vast to be reviewed here, but it can be said that there are numerous excellent studies documenting the relationship between social class membership and practically every other aspect of living. The life chances of an individual--his opportunities and hazards with respect to morbidity, mortality, education, success--have been shown to be related to class membership. Life styles as revealed in such indices as methods of child training, family rituals, leisure-time activities, religious preferences, and extent and type of participation in formally organized activities are correlated with social class. So, to an extent, is personality. Where a person lives and in what kind of dwelling; what he works at and what amount he receives for his services; how much education he has had; what his religion is; whom he marries; what he belongs to; what he does with his spare time; the age at which he marries; the size of his family; whether or not his wife will work; the way he manages his funds; his moral behavior; his relationships with community agencies; the stability of his family--all these and many other characteristics are related to his social class position. And all these are factors that, in one way or another, are related to the work of public health programs.

The significance of social class for the way people related to health agencies and services is shown in a series of studies that have been made and are still going on at Yale University. At one psychiatric clinic, for example, where the experience of all who presented themselves for an entire year was observed, it was found that 1) whether or not a person was accepted for treatment was directly related to his social class position; 2) there was a significant difference in the training of personnel assigned to treat patients in the various social classes;; 3) the duration of therapy differed significantly from one class to another. It was found that in the words of one report "where the economic factor was held constant, acceptace for therapy and the character of subsequent clinical experience were related significantly to the patient's social class; the higher an individual's social class position, the more likely he was to be accepted for treatment, to be treated by highly trained personnel, and to be treated intensively over a long period."[9] (Myers and Schaffer, A.J.S., 19:307-10, June 1954)

A considerable contribution to our knowledge of the relation of class to attitudes and practices relating to health and illness was made by Earl Koos in his recent book The Health of Regionville. Regionville is the fictitious name of a town of some 1,500 householders in upper New York state. Repeated interviews with a panel of 514 families (16 interviews each) were used to test the hypothesis that "the health attitudes and behavior of a family are related to its position in the social class heirarchy of a community, and are significantly affected by the prescriptions and proscriptions regarding health shared by those who are members of the same social class. Further, there is a difference in the way and degree to which people participate in health activities in the community which is significantly associated with their membership in a social class." Koos findings are too detailed for summarizing, but it can be noted that his hypotheses were definitely confirmed by what he found. Statistically significant differences among the three classes into which he divided his study population were found for almost every variable he studies. He noted in particular tendency of the lowest class group to ignore symptoms that led higher class groups to seek medical attention, to rely more heavily on non-medical treatment (self or family care, use of patent medicines, treatment by marginal practitioners), and to be more dissatisfied with the medical care they did receive than was true of the higher classes. How the health and treatment picture looks from the other side of the social class line is clearly revealed in the series of quotations Koos reproduces from his interviews. A lower class housewife with untreated prolapse of the uterus revealed, for example, where any health matter other than the most disabling stood in the scale of values of her family when she commented about her condition. "I wish I could get it fixed up, but we've just got some other things that are more important first. Our car's a wreck, and we're going to get another one. We need a radio, too, and some other things. If my husband's job holds out, we'll get them, and then I'll have it done, if it doesn't cost too much. But it's got to wait for now--there's always something more important."[10] Another lady told how she felt about hospital delivery and post natal care: "I would of had my kid at home, but the doctor wouldn't let me. I was born at home--all my kin was too. I was almost mad enought to stay at home and just have my mother or somebody help me. But I went to the hospital, and then he wanted me to come back. Nuts to him, I said. I didn't see any reason to go--I felt fine, so I just didn't. I'm not going to do something like that when my mother didn't and my girl friends don't neither."[11] And as a final example, summing up the difficulties of communication across both professional--laymen and social class barriers, the observation of a Class III man that might be profitably framed and hung in every physician's office: "Nobody should blame the doc if he doesn't fix them up right away--or maybe never. But maybe things would be better if the doc understood us, and if we always knew what the hell he was driving at--and not in big words either."[12] Good intentions and benevolent motives are no substitute for understanding---and social class difference can interpose barriers to understanding unless they are consciously recognized and methods worked out to minimize their influence.

A final kind of difference that can affect the work of public health programs is that associated with ethnic group membership. Like the other areas I have mentioned, this one is complex enough to be treated in a book: and, in fact, it has been in several: Spicer's Human Problems in Technological Change;[13] Margaret Mead's Cultural Patterns and Technical Change[14]; and my own Cultural Difference and Medical Care,[15] among them. Perhaps the significance of this kind of difference can most easily be illustrated with a story from Spicer's book dealing with the well intentioned attempts of a county agricultural agent to introduce a better producing type of hybrid corn into the agricultural practices of a New Mexican village.[16] The sequence of events was roughly this. The agent concerned with the poor yield and uncertain quality of the corn usually grown discussed with village leaders the merits of a new corn, a type that would give about three times the yield of the type traditionally grown. Forty of eighty-four growers were persuaded by a series of discussions and planted the new corn. The production per acre was double that of the preceeding year. Next year, however, only thirty farmers planted the hybrid, and the year following that only three. Everyone else had gone back to the old crop. The reason: the housewives did not like the new corn. The color was wrong; the taste was not exactly to their liking; it did not mex well in tortitllas; the texture of the meal was not good. The old corn, poor as it was, was traditional, was a part of the culture. The new was an innovation. And even though the new would have brought more yield, more food, and more surplus to sell--these considerations were not enough to offset the taste and preference for the old.

Public health personnel in Wyoming, like those in other states of the west and southwest, are likely to have to cope with some situations in which ethnic membership is a factor. Several thousand Indians live in the state and a number of others, together with a sizeable group of Spanish-Americans and Mexican-Americans, come in from time to time seeking seasonal work. Here, as elsewhere, there are lingering cultural residuals brought in and in some instances perpetuated by persons of European ancestry. In dealing with populations of different ethnic background, the problem of communication is both less difficult and more difficult than when working with persons exhibiting differences of the other types I have mentioned. Communication is easier because often the fact of cultural difference is readily apparent and it is expected that greater efforts will be required if effective communication is to be established. One expects, for instance, that a Navajo will behave somewhat differently in some situations than an Anglo and one consequently takes greater pains to make clear to him what behavior is expected and exactly how he will benefit from it. Communication across ethnic lines is harder than that among members of the same group because of obvious factors like language difference and more subtle influences like the ways perceptual patterns are related to language. It is [illegible] often harder to bring about desired cultural changes because there may exist in an ethnic group unexpected and unanticipated customs or practices or beliefs that run counter to the changes being introduced. Margaret Mead's Cultural Patterns and Technical Change lists literally hundreds of these specifically related to health practices and for that reason is a work that I think should be read and re-read by every public health person whose work brings him or her into any kind of professional relationship with members of another ethnic group. (Book now available in a paperbound pocket edition.) It is particularly important, in situations involving cross-cultural relationships, to remember that not only are the "out-group" members creatures of their cultural and sub-cultural environments, but that we "in-group" members also carry about with us an enormous and sometimes unsuspected cultural baggage, not all of which is of crucial importance for the public health goals we are seeking to achieve. In dealing with people of another culture we need to be clear about what is nutritional necessity, for example, and what is merely our tribal customs--like emphasis on eating three times a day, or a preference for hot foods, or the notion that diets need to be balanced within a 24-hour period. We need to distinguish between the cleanliness that is related to hygiene and our own middle class preference for tidiness and order and to separate what is essential in sanitation from our customary procedures. As Spicer has warned: "It should be constantly borne in mind in cross-cultural situations that the cultures in which we grow up predispose us to certain views and values. (And I have added, so do the ones we subsequently learn, such as professions.) We come to another culture with preconceptions about what is good and what is rational or sensible, which do not hold universally and these preconceptions may result in great misunderstanding. Setting aside those preconceptions, especially in the highly developed fields of technical specialism and administrative management in our culture, is one of the most difficult, as well as most necessary, disciplines in any work that goes on across cultural boundaries."[17]

Although I have said nothing specific about public health nurses or their work, I feel that they, more perhaps than any other type of public health personnel, are affected by the kinds of factors I have been talking about. Their work (or your work, I perhaps should say) brings them most frequently into situations where cultural differences come into play. In their relationships with the many publics they deal with, they have numerous opportunities to observe the effects of professional-lay differences, of variation between rural and urban life styles, of social class membership, and of ethnic difference on the operation of public health progress. It is perhaps more important for public health nurses than for any other group in public health to know the characteristics of the populations being served and to recognize the extent to which behavior is a function of cultural and sub-cultural conditioning. From their strategic position on what might be called the front line of public health work they can perform the vitally important function of translating the policies and intentions of many types of professional people in public health into activities and suggestions that have meaning in terms of the cultural understandings and expectations of the laymen with whom they work. And unless this is done--and done well with understanding, compassion, and a genuine respect for cultural difference--no public health program that involves direct interaction between professional people and the public they serve can be fully effective.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

1. Adams, Richard: "A Nutritional Research Program in Guatemala." In Benjamin D. Paul, editor, *Health, Culture, and Community*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1955.

2. Zborowski, Mark: "Cultural Components in Response to Pain." *Journal of Social Issues*, 8:(4) 16-31, 1952.

3. Walter, Paul A. F., Jr.: *Race and Culture Relations*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952. p.17.

4. Mead, Margaret, editor: *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 1953. p. 9-10.

5. Simmons, Leo and Harold G. Wolff: *Social Science in Medicine*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954. p. 94-95.

6. Koos, Earl Loman: *The Health of Regionville*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954. p.34.

7. Hanlon, John J.: *Principles of Public Health Administration*. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co., 1955. p. 108.

8. Wellin, Edward: "Water Boiling in a Peruvian Town." In Benjamin D. Paul, editor, *op. cit.*

9. Myers, Jerome K. and Leslie Schaffer: "Social Stratification and Psychiatric Practice: A Study of an Out-Patient Clinic." *American Sociological Review*, 307-10, June 1954.

10. Koos, Earl Loman, *op. cit.*, p.37.

11. Ibid., p.67.

12. Ibid., p. 77.

13. Spicer, Edward H., editor: *Human Problems in Technological Change*. New York: Russell Safe Foundation, 1952.

14. Mead, Margaret, *op. cit.*

15. Saunders, Lyle: *Cultural Difference and Medical Care*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954.

16. Apodaca, Anacleto: "Corn and Custom." In Edward H. Spicer, editor, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-40.

17. Spicer, Edward H., *op. cit.* pp. 291-292.